DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 903 CS 010 453

AUTHOR Smith, Michael Sloane
TITLE A Study of the Socialization of Student Teachers with a Whole Language Perspective.
PUB DATE 8 Aug 90
NOTE 232p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Elementary Education; Higher Education; Language Arts; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; Teaching Conditions; *Teaching Experience; *Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS Student Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Socialization

ABSTRACT

To date there has been no research done on teacher education programs that use whole language as a vehicle for instilling reflective forms of pedagogy. This study is an initial effort to develop a research base in this area. The study examined the socialization process of teachers who adopted the teaching perspectives of the whole language approach in a variety of placement sites. Subjects, six white female elementary student teachers, were specifically chosen for their high degree of commitment and a well-informed understanding of the philosophy of whole language. The primary methods used for data gathering were interviews, observations, and examinations of relevant documents. Results indicated: (1) the basic tenets of whole language philosophy are in line with those tenets of reflective pedagogy that many educators are attempting to promote; (2) the subjects' teacher education program was responsible for moving them towards their whole language perspectives but was deficient in many areas; (3) subjects faced many constraining factors during the student teaching experience, including interactive, personal, institutional, and cultural factors; and (4) all the subjects continued to support verbally their original beliefs about whole language, even though they were forced to conform to the existing curriculum. (One-hundred seventy-two references and a list of questions asked during the initial interviews are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329903

A STUDY OF THE SOCIALIZATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS WITH A WHOLE LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVE

By

Michael Sloane Smith

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Education
Indiana University
August, 1990

CS010453

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael S Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee:

Norman V. Overly, Ph.D., Chairperson

Jesse Goodman, Ph.D., Director of Thesis

Anna Ochoa, Ph.D.

Jerome C. Harste, Ph.D.

August 8, 1990

© 1990

Michael Sloane Smith

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the six women who served as the informants for this study. Their efforts to teach using the reflective teaching practices of whole language despite the many roadblocks they encountered is an inspiration to teacher educators who, like myself, are committed to helping future teachers become reflective about their teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people I wish to thank. Jesse Goodman offered much assistance along the way. He provided feedback which broadened my perspective and offered a course of direction for my study. Norm Overly listened to me as I discussed the data I was finding in the field. His interest in what I was telling him gave me confidence that what I was finding was worthwhile and important. Moreover, Norm proofread one of my later drafts, finding numerous "little" mistakes that needed correcting.

The graduate students and professors from the Language Education Department assisted me in numerous ways. Jerry Harste was always willing to listen to how my study was progressing; his comments and ideas were helpful. Carol Nelson, Bruce Robbins, and Evalyn Hanssen showed interest in what I was doing. I spent several hours with them discussing my study. I found these discussion sessions valuable not only for the ideas that were generated, but for the support that was offered.

Maribeth Winslow deserves special thanks for all the hours she spent editing earlier drafts. Besides pointing out mistakes in punctuation and ways to make sentences more precise, she would find substantive weaknesses in the way I was saying things. Her comments caused me to think, and I would usually end up rewriting the sections she had a concern about. All those rewrites made the finished product

much better.

I am indebted to the six women who served as the informants for this study. They always took time out from their busy schedule to talk with me about their experience. They taught me what life was like for a student teacher committed to the principles of whole language. Additionally, I am grateful to those cooperating teachers who allowed me to come into their classrooms and spend time.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, Marita, for all the help she has given me during this study. She provided financial support during the four years I spent at Indiana University working on my degree. She took on the goal of finishing the dissertation and made it our goal. Not only did she free up my time so that I could spend time each day working on the dissertation, but she offered assistance in typing, proofreading, and solving any problems I had with the computer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1	WHOLE LANGUAGE AS A MEANS TOWARDS REFLECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES	1
	Two Current Trends in Teacher Preparation	3
	Technical Approach	4
	Reflective Approach	5
	Figure 1 Summary of the Differences Between Technical Approach and Reflective Approach	8
	The Nature of Schools and Teacher's Work	8
	Whole Language as a Form of Reflective Pedagogy	14
	Teacher Education as a Way of Reforming Public Schools	18
	Socializing Effect of Student Teaching	19
	Deficiencies in Teacher Socialization Research	23
	Research that Documents Student Teacher Resistance	25
	Research Goals and Questions	27
	End Notes	30
2	METHODOLOGY: AN INTERPRETIVE FIELDWORK APPROACH	31
	Theoretical Framework	32
	The Nature of Reality	32
	The Relationship of Knower to Known	32
	The Possibility of Generalization	33
	Possibility of Causal Linkages	33
	The Role of Values	34
	Characteristics of Interpretive Field Work	36
	The Sample Selection	37
	Logistics: Schedule of Observations and Interviews	40
	Methods of Data Collection	41
	Data Analysis	47
	Trustworthiness and Authenticity	50
	End Notes	54
3	MANIFESTING A WHOLE LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVE IN THE CLASSROOM	55
	Existing School Practices	57
	Knowledge and Learning	60
	Curriculum	64
	Concept of Teachers	73
	Concept of Students	83
	Summary	88
	Informants' Responses	89

4 CONSTRAINING FACTORS ON WHOLE LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVES 91
Blocks to Initial Whole Language Perspectives: Four Vignettes 92
Linda's Context 92
Karen's Context 94
Carol's Context 97
Jane's Context 98
Four Levels of Constraints 101
Interactive Level 102
Significant Others Constraints 104
Student Constraints 110
Time Constraints 113
Personal Level 116
Institutional Level 122
Cultural Level 133
Summary 139
Informants' Responses 141

5 SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND ENABLING FACTORS 143
Strategies and Options Used During Student Teaching 144
Critical Compliance 147
Figure 2 Strategies and Options used by the Informants during their Student Teaching 148
Accommodative Resistance 149
Resistance Alteration 150
Transformative Action 152
Correspondence Compliance 153
Encouraged Curricular Action 155
Enabling Factors 157
Favorable Pupil Responses 158
Institutional Support 160
Teacher Education Programs 166
Personal Dispositions for Reflective Teaching 170
Personal Knowledge Base 172
Commitment 174
Talent 176
Support From Mentoring Relationship 180
Summary 183
Informants' Responses 185

6 MAKING WHOLE LANGUAGE WHOLE: WHAT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS CAN DO 187
Recommendations 190
Suggestions for Future Research 207

REFERENCES 211

APPENDIX A 222

CHAPTER ONE

WHOLE LANGUAGE AS A MEANS TOWARDS REFLECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES

During the past decade, many calls for educational reform have been issued by state departments, national commissions and professional scholars (e.g., U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983); Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983; Adler, 1983). Concurrently, reports such as "The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education" (Joyce & Clift, 1984), Teachers for Tomorrow's Schools (Holmes Group, 1986), and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Task Force, 1986) have come out with proposals for improving the nature of teacher education programs in this country.

The rationale behind teacher education reform seems simple: Current teaching practices in public schools are unacceptable and are in need of reform. By educating future teachers to be more thoughtful and to use better teaching methods, schools will eventually be better places for students to learn. However, the way schools of education go about educating future teachers to be more thoughtful is a subject of considerable debate. The majority of teacher training programs in this country are built on what Zeichner (1983) calls a "technical" tradition "where the primary concern is with fostering the development of skill in an actual performance of a predetermined task" (p. 4).

Within this debate on teacher preparation, a growing number of educators are calling for future teachers to begin using reflective approaches to pedagogy (e.g., Smyth, 1989; Tom, 1985; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). Their contention is that public schools are dominated by a technocratic approach to education that is only reinforced by the technical tradition of most teacher training institutions.

One collective voice calling for future teachers to adopt a reflective stance to curriculum and instruction is from "whole language" educators. They, like other college instructors supportive of reflective pedagogy, are educating future teachers to question the technocratic forms of instruction found in most public school classrooms. Furthermore, they are urging future teachers to take control of the classroom curriculum.

A considerable amount of research has been done on teacher education programs which suggests that the ideals learned during preservice course work, such as a reflective approach to teaching, are wiped out by the conservative socializing forces found in the student teaching phase (e.g., Hoy and Rees, 1977; Hodges, 1982). However, some research exists suggesting that, in some instances, student teachers are able to maintain their ideal perspectives despite the conservative nature of student teaching (Goodman, 1988; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985). If there is a genuine desire for educating future teachers to become more reflective, then more research is needed to look at how

particular programs of teacher education help future teachers become more reflective practitioners. To date there has been no research done on teacher education programs that use whole language as a vehicle for instilling reflective forms of pedagogy. This study is an initial effort to develop a research base in this area.

Chapter one will be divided into five main sections. First, the two current trends on the way future teachers are prepared in this country will be described. Second, the nature of public schools and the nature of the teachers' work in these schools will be explored. Third, the contributions that whole language instruction is making to teaching and teacher education will be presented. Fourth, extant research on the efficacy of teacher preparation as a vehicle for teacher reform will be presented. Finally, the research goals and questions that will give focus to the research study will be outlined.

Two Current Trends in Teacher Preparation

Broadly speaking there are two general approaches to the preparation of future teachers: a technical approach and a reflective approach (Beyer, 1986). These two approaches are built on different theoretical foundations concerning the nature of knowledge, the conception of students and teachers, and the way curriculum is constructed and delivered. It is argued in this chapter that the technical approach is closely aligned to that which currently takes

place in schools; thus its efficacy in effecting meaningful change is questionable.

Technical Approach

Scholars advocating a technical approach toward teacher preparation base their work on extensive process-product research which maintains that certain principles and instructional practices are strongly related to students' learning (Anderson, Evertson & Brophy, 1979; Rosenshine, 1986; Good & Grouws, 1977, 1981). Anderson, et al. (1979, p.193) define process-product research as the "relationship between what teachers do in the classroom (the process of teaching) and what happens to their students (the product of teaching). With this approach, future teachers prepare to utilize specific instructional skills that have been proven to yield higher pupil-achievement-scores. For example, Rosenshine (1986) has outlined the following six "teaching functions" that, when used systematically, can lead to higher student achievement: review, presentation of new materials, guided practice, feedback and correction, independent practice, and weekly and monthly reviews.[1] Moreover, Rosenshine (1986, p. 60) recommends that the six teaching functions are best "applicable to any 'well structured' discipline where the objective is to teach performance skills or mastery of a body of knowledge."

According to Zeichner (1983), the curriculum for prospective teachers who are taught by a technical approach, which he refers to as a behavioristic approach, "is fully

determined in advance by others often on the basis of research on teacher effectiveness" (p. 4). Zeichner adds, "[T]he prospective teacher is viewed primarily as a passive recipient of this professional knowledge and plays little part in determining the substance and direction of his or her preparation program" (p. 4).

Future teachers' perspectives on teaching from the technical approach become that of transferring the prescribed curriculum[2] into the students' minds by using the professional skills that have been scientifically proven to yield greater gains in student achievement.

The Reflective Approach

The reflective approach, on the other hand, has its roots in the ideas of John Dewey. Dewey (1910) defines reflective thought as the "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends" (p. 6). Dewey (1933) extended his definition of reflective action to include three attitudes of mind: 1) openmindedness--giving full attention to alternate possibilities, 2) responsibility--carefully considering the consequences to which an action leads, and 3) wholeheartedness--willingly taking action.

Since Dewey, there have been different meanings and purposes attributed to reflective thinking (Gore, 1987) that have made their way into models for teacher education. For example, Gore (1987) points out that there are fundamental

differences between reflective thinking portrayed by Cruickshank and Zeichner. The major difference is that Cruickshank (1985) restricts the focus of reflection to means, that is, methods for achieving prespecified goals, and in so doing, risks these means becoming ends in themselves. Cruickshank's disregard of ends likens his method to the technical approach, which is mainly concerned with helping prospective teachers develop the technical skill to deliver the prescribed curriculum to students. Zeichner's notion, on the other hand, fits more closely with that of Dewey and is considered a more accurate portrayal of reflective teaching. For this study, the definition of reflection will resemble Zeichner's (1983) idea and can best be understood by looking at three important dimensions that distinguish it from the technical approach.

First is the need for teachers to make the existing school practices problematic. As Tom (1985) puts it, "To make teaching problematic is to raise doubts about what, under ordinary circumstances, appears to be an effective or wise practice" (p. 37). Grant (1984) believes that teachers should make problematic their goals, their teaching actions, and their teaching-learning environments. By making existing school practices problematic, teachers can begin to reformulate "standard" practices. Their purposes, the particular content they will be using, and the needs and interests of the children in their classrooms will all be based on thoughtful decisions.

Secondly, if teachers are going to make existing practices problematic, they need a degree of autonomy to make decisions about goals, methods, and content. As many educators have pointed out (e.g., Kohl, 1976; Wise, 1988; Apple, 1986; Giroux, 1986), the quality of the education that takes place in classrooms depends to a large measure on the capacity of the teacher to make appropriate decisions. Without an appropriate degree of autonomy, teachers will be unable to make wise decisions concerning the goals, content, and methods best suited for their students.

The third dimension of reflective teaching is the view that educational phenomena are socially constructed; therefore, they are both time bound and culture specific. This position is summed up by Wise (1988) when he states:

> Because students are not standardized in their needs, stages of development, home environments, preconceptions, or learning styles, a given stimulus does not produce a predictable response. A teacher must make decisions based on knowledge of the student, of the subject matter, and of pedagogy in order to create the right conditions for learning. (p. 332)

Reflective teaching requires that teachers question those taken-for-granted practices in schools. They should see their roles defined as decision-makers, specifically for goals, content, and methods (See p. 8, Figure 1 for a summary of the technical and reflective approach.)

The next section will describe the kind of school practices that take place in U.S. schools. The discussion will be guided by the following framework of questions. What kind of ideology guides schools? What are the typical

forms of pedagogy used in classrooms? How are teacher and student roles defined? What kind of curriculums are in place and where do they come from? The answers to these questions will show that a "technocratic" ideology similar to that found in the technical approach to teacher preparation dominates curriculum and instruction in U.S. schools today.

Figure 1 Summary of the Differences between a Technical Approach and a Reflective Approach

	Technical Approach	Reflective Approach
Existing School practice	A Given	Problematic
Knowledge	Law-like--Generalizable to All Situations	Socially Constructed Time and Context Sensitive
Concept of Students	Passive--Standardized Needs, Prior Histories Neglected	Active--Interests & Needs Vary, Prior Histories Important
Concept of Teacher	Deliver Standardized Curriculum Using Scientifically Developed Techniques	Make Decisions on Goals, Content, & Methods
Curriculum	Pre-determined & Standardized. Content Broken into Discrete Skills	Based on Needs and Interests of Students

The Nature of Schools and Teachers' Work

Similar to teacher education programs, curricula and forms of instruction found in most public schools today are dominated by a technocratic approach to education (Greene, 1978; Cornbleth, 1987; Giroux, 1980; Eisner, 1982; Postman,

1979). Maxine Greene (1978), in explaining the effects of a technocratic approach to school practice, states:

> Schools are being directed to focus upon discrete 'competencies,' on basic skills. The focal preoccupations are with efficiency, with accountability in terms of what is measurable. There is continuing talk of behavioral engineering, of the values of management expertise. (p. 57)

According to Elliot Eisner (1982), a technocratic approach to education manifests itself in several ways: 1) the increased emphasis on goals of achievement, especially in areas considered basic such as the 3 Rs; 2) the advent of commercially developed instructional packages that break up complex skills into small steps so that each step can be taken one at a time; and 3) the use of evaluation tools (e.g., state mandated achievement tests) that use "objective" means for demonstrating the effectiveness of the teaching.

In the schools John Goodlad (1984) studied, he found that the focus in the first nine grades was on language arts and mathematics. He also found schools were focusing attention on acquiring basic skills and facts instead of focusing on "intellectual development," i.e., the ability to think rationally; the ability to use, evaluate, and accumulate knowledge; and a desire for further learning.

In the area of English/language arts programs, Goodlad (1984) notes:

> Workbooks and work sheets, often a part of daily instruction, were used cumulatively by many teachers to mark pupil progress and achievement. These frequently were duplicated from commercial materials. The directions given on work sheets often were 'copy

> the sentence' or 'circle each verb' or 'combine two sentences into one' or 'add correct punctuation.' (p. 207)

The effects of this technocratic ideology on curriculum materials powerfully influences teachers' work. According to many writers (e.g., Giroux, 1984; Wise, 1988; Apple and Teitelbaum, 1986; Woodward, 1986; Densmore, 1987), teachers are giving up control over the curricular and instructional decisions that take place in their classrooms. Densmore (1987) notes that "calls by the public for accountability. . .are frequently answered via the imposition of standardized, prefigured curricula" (p. 141). Behind this trend toward standardization of educational objectives, content materials, student evaluation, and teacher evaluation, stands the ever expanding role of state departments of education (Wise, 1988).

Curricular and instructional decisions, mandated by the state, are becoming more and more driven by standardized tests. Wise (1988) explains how teachers' decisions are being affected by such exams:

> Some teachers begin to emphasize the content that they know will appear on the test. They begin to teach in a format that will prepare students to deal with the content as it will be tested. Some even teach items that are likely to appear on the test. Meanwhile, the rest of the curriculum is de-emphasized. (p. 330)

Another form of teacher control is the flood of "teacher proof" instructional materials. Apple and Teitelbaum (1986) note that these instructional materials outline "the goals, teaching methods, content, pre- and

post-test, and appropriate student responses" (p. 181). What effects teacher-proof materials have on teaching is explained by Giroux (1984):

> These materials promote a deskilling of teachers by separating conception from execution and by reducing the role that teachers play in the actual creation and teaching of such materials. Teacher decisions about what should be taught, how it might meet the intellectual and cultural needs of students, and how it might be evaluated are rendered unimportant in these packages, since they have already pre-defined and answered such questions. The materials control teachers' decisions and, as a result, teachers do not need to exercise reasoned judgment. Thus, teachers are reduced to the role of obedient technicians, carrying out the dictates of the curriculum packages. (p. 35)

Apple and Teitelbaum (1986) describe two important consequences of standardized curriculum and instruction through state mandated tests and pre-packaged, teacher-proof instructional materials on teachers' work. The first consequence is what they call the "separation of conception from execution." Because someone outside of the immediate situation now has greater control over both the planning and what is actually to occur, teachers lose sight of their decision-making power as to what gets taught and how it is to be taught. The second consequence is what Apple and Teitelbaum term "deskilling." This phenomenon results when teachers allow their planning skills to atrophy. In other words, "lack of use leads to loss" (Apple & Teitelbaum, 1986, p. 179).

Nowhere is the loss of teacher control over curriculum and instruction more deeply felt than in the teaching of language arts, particularly reading, in elementary schools.

Rosenshine (1978) and Goodlad (1984) both found that elementary schools devoted about twice the amount of time to reading instruction compared to mathematics instruction--which ranked second in amount of instructional time. The amount of instructional time devoted to the teaching of reading indicates that teaching children how to read is the elementary schools' top priority. Because reading is the most important event, it becomes most subject to the external controls of state mandated tests and pre-packaged, teacher-proof curricula.

De Castell and Luke (1987) report that schools, under increased pressure from society for a more literate high school graduate are "continuing development and mass scale implementation of so-called teacher-proof curriculum packages and standardized testing programs" (p. 417). They further report that the majority of classrooms in elementary schools today use commercially produced reading materials as the primary method for learning to read. A study by Marion Rosecky (1978) found that 90% of the teachers he surveyed used the teachers' manual to help guide instruction most of the time or all of the time. Rosecky concludes:

> Are teachers selective when using basal guidebooks (teachers' manuals)? Probably not, if their practices are similar to the majority of teachers described in this study. (p. 384)

Pre-packaged, teacher-proof reading curricula take the form of commercially produced reading materials that come complete with scripted teacher's manuals, student reading

books and workbooks, ditto-masters, and achievement tests. In other words, commercial reading materials become the total reading program.

A survey of teachers and administrators by Shannon (1987) revealed that commercial reading materials were considered the technological solutions to the problems of reading instruction. He further explains:

> Since both administrators and teachers reified reading instruction as commercial reading materials, few questioned the legitimacy of this form of technical control. In these materials, administrators found an economical and less confrontational means for instructional accountability, and teachers found both the source and the tools of reading instruction. Teachers willingly accepted this technical control as simply 'the way to teach reading.' (p 319)

In an examination of language arts instruction, Petty and Finn (1981) found that seventy-five percent of grade four teachers reported they almost always administered objective tests in writing and language study. They also found that "filling in the blanks" remained the central component of writing and language arts programs (p. 27).

In sum, the content of classroom curricula is largely composed of standardized knowledge and skills which take the form of pre-packaged, commercially produced materials. In order to deliver the knowledge and learning processes contained in the commercial materials, a technologically-based delivery system has been set up. This technological approach breaks up learning processes into discrete skills and delivers them in proper sequence to students. Standardized tests are used to evaluate how well students

have mastered the skills and content contained in the materials. The teacher's job is to execute the technologically based program by following the scripted directions provided in his/her teacher's manual. The student's job is to learn what the commercial materials are delivering and, above all, to do well on the standardized tests that measure how much they have learned.

The evidence given above shows that American classrooms are clearly dominated by a technocratic ideology. It is hard to believe that teacher education programs advocating more of the same are going to make meaningful changes in the way schools go about teaching students.

Many critics of current school practices are advocating forms of reflective teaching which empower teachers to take control of curriculum and instruction (e.g., Tom, 1985; Grant, 1984; Zeichner, 1983; Gore, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). One such group of educators advocating reform by using forms of reflective pedagogy call themselves "whole-language" educators. Their voice is becoming increasingly more audible in educational circles.[3] The next section will explore the contribution that whole language is making to the discourse on teaching and teacher-education reform.

Whole Language As a Form of Reflective Pedagogy

Whole language is primarily an elementary school movement that stems from the writing and research of individuals such as Ken Goodman (1986), Jerry Harste,

Virginia Woodward, & Carolyn Burke (1984), Frank Smith (1978), Judith Newman (1986), and M. A. K. Halliday (1975).

Whole language does not prescribe a specific methodology for instruction; rather, it is a philosophy that brings together a theory of learning and a theory of language to help inform teachers how to teach students. The philosophy of whole language has been called a paradigm shift (Rich, 1985), a grass-roots movement (Goodman, Smith, Meredith, & Goodman, 1987), a way to organize curriculum (Harste & Deford, 1982), and a reaction against atomistic and mechanistic school programs (Goodman, et al., 1987). Its basic tenets challenge many of the existing practices in schools today.

The whole language philosophy challenges the notion that processes such as reading and writing can be broken down into discrete skill lessons so as to make learning more digestible for students. Instead of reducing reading and writing into a sequence of skills--for example matching letter names with sounds, identifying parts of speech, and sounding out words--whole language begins with whole texts and whole writings. Whole language advocates such as Holdaway (1979) see learning to read and write as a process similar to that of language acquisition by young children.

Secondly, whole language challenges the way language arts is arbitrarily and artificially fragmented into the separate subjects of spelling, grammar, and reading (Smith, 1986). Goodman, et al. (1987) advocate that whole language

"is a curriculum for the development of language and thinking, and it is a curriculum for learning through language and thinking" (p. 6). Instead of dividing the school day into separate subjects such as reading, social studies, and science, whole language proponents see the daily integration of all subjects using the tools of language arts (writing, reading, listening, and, speaking) as the means for learning.

A third challenge of the whole language movement is for teachers to move away from the content and direction provided by commercially produced materials[4] and to rely instead on their own experience and teaching skill (Goodman, 1986). Frank Smith (1986) states:

> No one is in a better position than a teacher to identify a particular child's needs or interests or difficulties at a particular time. Teachers should not ask what they ought to do, but what they need to know in order to be able to make productive decisions. Even if teachers do get their practical questions answered--and there is no shortage of experts to give them advice or of materials producers to promote their wares--the final responsibility rests with the teacher. The teacher must still decide which expert to trust, which materials to try. (p. 187)

Whole language teachers formulate their curriculum based on the information provided from observations of their students. Successful teachers "must be proficient 'kid watchers,' able to monitor the progress of pupils and see their strengths and problems in action" (Goodman, 1979, p. 662). Because whole language teachers base curriculum on students' backgrounds, interests, and needs, classrooms can

not be a place where standardized materials are taught in a standardized way.

In summary, whole language activists say that teachers must make existing school practices problematic and begin to formulate curriculum and instruction based on informed knowledge (both expert and their own) concerning language; language learning; and student backgrounds, interests, and needs. Since students' backgrounds and experiences are not all the same, the strengths, needs, and interests of students in particular classrooms will all be different--ruling out standardized curriculums and standardized means of instruction.

De Castell and Luke (1987) show evidence that many teachers in American classrooms are periodically using whole language ideas. But they add, "[F]or a majority of students basic literacy instruction consists of the basal reading program, augmented by correlatively mechanistic approaches to the teaching of writing: weekly spelling lists following the Monday through Friday pre- and posttest. . .work sheet exercises on grammar and punctuation, and objective tests on usage" (p. 424). In other words, whole language teaching is the exception rather than the rule.

One way to begin reforming classrooms away from the mechanistic tendencies of a technical approach and toward more teacher empowering, reflective teaching practices is through teacher education. The next section will look at the efficacy of teacher education in terms of orientating

teachers' perspectives away from traditional school practices and toward more reflective teaching behaviors, thus, toward reform of classroom teaching practices.

Teacher Education as a Way of Reforming Public Schools

The efficacy of teacher education programs in bringing about significant changes in teaching behavior is a subject of disagreement in academic discourse. Some, such as Hoy and Rees (1977) and Pruitt and Lee (1978), believe that the student teaching experience wipes out the ideal images instilled in pre-service course work. These new teachers encounter, then adopt, the conservative perspectives of existing school practices. Others, such as Lortie (1975), believe that teacher education programs can not counter the strong latent influences of the more than 10,000 hours that future teachers have spent being a student. Still others, such as Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) and Goodman (1988) believe that under certain conditions teacher education programs can help assist teachers in the development of their teaching perspectives.

Despite the disagreement over the assessment of the impact of teacher education on future teachers' perspectives, there is little doubt that the experiences they receive during their teacher education programs contribute to the overall socialization process that inducts them into the profession of teaching. Lortie (1975) defines socialization as "a subjective process that happens to people as they move through a series of structured

experiences and internalize the subculture of the group" (p. 61). How future teachers learn to teach is not determined, however, by any one influence such as pre-service course work. Rather, there are many influences, such as prior experiences of being a student, pre-service course work, early field experiences, and student teaching, which all contribute to the socialization of beginning teachers.

There is widespread agreement that the student teaching experience is the most important aspect of the teacher education program. For example, Conant (1963) called student teaching "the one indisputably essential element in professional education" (p. 142). In Lortie's (1975) interviews, prospective teachers chose student teaching as the most helpful portion of their teacher education program. Follow-up interviews with teachers concerning their teacher education programs also indicate that student teaching was of most value to them (Gibson, 1979; Gallenmore, 1979; Dickinson, 1979). Therefore, the effects teacher education programs have on future teachers' perspectives on teaching, and thus on teacher reform, will be largely determined by the socializing impact of student teaching.

Socializing Effect of Student Teaching

According to Beyer and Zeichner (1987), the predominant view regarding the socializing effects of student teaching is one in which the student teacher's perspective eventually corresponds with the school's existing forms of teaching and school practices. Several studies have found evidence to

suggest that student teachers give up their liberal ideas learned at the university and adopt the conservative views of existing forms of pedagogy found in their classroom sites (Hoy & Rees, 1977; Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., Jr., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H., 1983; Hodges, 1982). As Pruitt and Lee (1978) explain, ". . .innovative and idealistic student teachers often meet stern opposition, become frustrated and then conform in a last ditch effort to salvage a grade" (p. 71).

Zeichner (1980) has compartmentalized the characteristics of the socialization research of student teachers into three categories: 1) studies that show the influence of the cooperating teacher, 2) studies that show the influence of the classroom's ecological environment, and 3) studies that show the conservative influence of the school bureaucracy.

The first influence, cooperating teachers, has been pointed out by Friebus (1977) to be the most heavily researched area of student teacher socialization. Karmos and Jacko (1977) point out that student teachers see their cooperating teachers as their most significant socializing agents. Other studies have shown that the attitudes and behaviors of student teachers shift toward those of their cooperating teachers by the end of the experience (e.g., McIntyre, 1984; Seperson & Joyce, 1973; Yee, 1969).

The second line of research suggests that the classroom's ecological environment (e.g., teacher-pupil

ratio, student ability, resources and supplies) plays an important role in controlling both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher (Doyle, 1977). Copeland (1980) points out that "the relationships that have been detected between cooperating teachers and student teachers may be the result of shaping forces exerted on both by the ecological system of the classroom" (p. 197). Hodges (1982) conducted a study in which she found 100% of the student teachers in her study gave up their perspectives on teaching reading, which they had learned in their reading methods courses, to assume the existing forms of practice found in schools. She attributes this to the ecological characteristics of classrooms and schools because in her study none of the student teachers had cooperating teachers.

Zeichner's (1980) third category, conservative influence of school bureaucracy, demonstrates the influence exerted on classrooms from the bureaucratic structures of the school. Berger and Luckman (1967) point out that "institutions, by the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up pre-defined patterns of conduct which control in one direction as against the many other directions that would theoretically be possible" (p.55). Hoy and Rees (1977) found that student teachers became significantly more custodial in their pupil control orientations after their student teaching experience. They attribute this custodial orientation to the following:

> Bureaucratic organizations attempt to mold role ideology and role performance of personnel through a

> variety of procedures and mechanisms designed to make individual beliefs, values, and norms correspond with those of the organization. (p.23)

The influence of bureaucratic control is consistent with Becker's (1964) assertion that "the structural characteristics of institutions and organizations provide the framework of the situations in which experience dictates the expediency of change" (p. 52). Goodman's (1988) research on student teacher socialization found that the one factor which exerted the most influence on the way student teachers taught was the instructional materials adopted by the school district. Goodman's finding is consistent with that which Shannon (1987) found to be the controlling factor in the way reading is taught in the elementary school, i.e., using commercial reading materials.

These three lines of research suggest that the socializing forces inherent in student teaching will steer future teachers' perspectives away from any liberal teaching practices, such as the reflective forms of whole language pedagogy, and toward the more conservative practices in schools. Therefore, teacher education programs seem to offer very little help in effecting significant changes in schools.

Despite the bleak portrayal painted by the research on student teacher socialization, there are two reasons for hope. First, there are noted deficiencies in much of the research in this area. Second, there does exist some

research which indicates limited student teacher resistance toward the traditional practices found in their field sites.

Deficiencies in Student Teacher Socialization Research

According to Watts, (1986) most of the research studies on teacher education "are of questionable quality" (p. 154). Applegate (1986) points out that much of the research relating to student teaching is based on information obtained from questionnaires, opinion polls, and evaluations by students, cooperating teachers, or college supervisors. Moreover, there is severe criticism over the lack of studies which have ecological validity (e.g., Griffin, 1986; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, & Zeichner, 1979; Zeichner, 1985). Zeichner (1985) voices these criticisms:

> Without direct observation of field experiences or some other attempt to document the experiences (e.g., through audio recordings), it becomes difficult to understand the nature and quality of the ecological elements of an experience and to discover developmental outcomes which may in some cases be more significant than those anticipated from a particular theoretical perspective. (p.50)

Another criticism of extant research on student teacher socialization is its over reliance on statistical data, data largely limited to the gross indicators of central tendencies (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner 1986). Using mean averages to generalize across the sample group disallows for any "deviant" cases that might appear. For example, Hoy and Rees's (1977) findings that student teachers were more custodial in their pupil control orientation was based on the significant mean scores of 79 student teachers. It is highly probable that out of the 79,

there were some who resisted the tendency to be custodial. But because the results were based on mean scores, we know nothing of these individuals. Goodman (1987) points out that very little is known about student teachers who "do not fit the common image of the intellectually passive and survival-conscious teacher" (p. 226).

Research in which data are collected through the use of questionnaires and surveys and which relies on statistical manipulation has a tendency to over simplify both the questions researchers ask and the answers they receive. Many reviewers of the literature on student teaching lament the lack of useful research available (Watts, 1986; Griffin, 1986; Fuller and Brown, 1975) As Lortie (1973) points out, the socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a single factor frame of reference" (p. 488). Student teaching socialization is impacted by many factors such as student teachers' prior histories (Lortie, 1975), their personal biographies (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986), the content of their per-service preparation (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984), the context of their field experience (Feiman-Nemser, 1983), and the influence of their cooperating teacher (Hoy and Rees, 1977). Much of the criticism leveled at extant research is due to the inability of such methodology to capture the complexity of the student teaching experience. Zeichner (1980) argues for "research strategies that [will] enable

the penetration of the complex and interrelated world of field-based experiences" (p. 52).

Perhaps the most condemning criticism of extant research relates to the treatment of both content of teacher education programs and context of field placement sites as homogeneous (Zeichner, 1986). Zeichner (1985) brought to light current researchers inattention to the content of university programs and the context of field site.[5] He found that all of the studies he analyzed in two major U.S. journals on teacher education failed to describe the content of the teacher education programs. Furthermore, he discovered an almost total lack of attention to the characteristics of the placement site. Many writers have pointed out that there is a great deal of variation between different placement sites (e.g., Beacher & Ade, 1982; Freiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Copeland, 1980). As was noted earlier, there are vast differences between a teacher education program built on a technical model and one built on a reflective model. Because of the researchers inattention to the content of the teacher education program and the context of the placement sites, Zeichner (1984) concludes:

> The question of the impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teachers should be recast in the future as one where attempts are made to link specific dimensions of programs and contextual factors to socialization outcomes. (p. 35).

Research that Documents Student Teacher Resistance

There are a few studies suggesting that, in certain instances, some student teachers adopt the teaching perspectives of their methods courses and continue to keep these perspectives throughout student teaching and into their first year of teaching (e.g., Goodman, 1988; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985; Lacey 1977). For example, Lacey (1977) found that some student teachers adopt a strategy which he calls "strategic compliance," meaning they retain a veneer of conformity in order to gain a favorable evaluation, but they continue to maintain their original perspectives. Lacey (1977) found other students who actively seek to change the range of acceptable behaviors within their classrooms. He called this strategy "strategic redefinition." In both cases, strategic compliance and strategic redefinition, the socialization of student teachers is more partial and incomplete than often believed.

Both Goodman (1988) and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) found categories similar to Lacey's.[6] It must be noted, however, that not all students' strategies resisted the dominant view that existed in the schools. In addition to strategic compliance and strategic redefinition, Lacey found internalized adjustment, in which student teachers incorporate the beliefs and practices they found in their student teaching classrooms. Again, Goodman (1988) and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) found similar categories.

Even though these studies found some student teachers who gave up their teaching perspectives and adopted those of the school, these studies challenge the notion that all student teachers passively correspond to the socializing effects of cooperating teacher, ecological classroom environments, and the bureaucratic structures found in the school. The conclusion of Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) speaks to the potential of teacher education:

> The most hopeful implication of this study is that a loss of idealism is not an inevitable result of induction into teaching and that the efforts of formal teacher preparation programs are not necessarily in vain. Under some conditions at least it appears possible for beginning teachers to find or to create opportunities for the expression of their ideals. (p.19)

Research Goals and Questions

The inability of teacher education to effect substantive changes in the perspectives of student teachers is not true for all prospective teachers. Much of the research on student teacher socialization points to the coercive nature of these experiences. This research shows that future teachers' liberal perspectives fall victim to the conservative forms of pedagogy commonly practiced in schools. However, several limitations of that research have been pointed out. Moreover, there does exist research indicating that some teachers resist the dominant forms of pedagogy found in schools and maintain their university instilled perspectives. Clearly, more research is needed that looks into the resistant patterns of student teachers with "high potential" to maintain their alternative styles

of pedagogy. We also need research on teacher socialization that covers a wide variety of teacher education programs and instills liberal forms of pedagogy in divergent classroom environments.

With the widespread push to effect reform both in public schools and in schools of education, the demand is great for a body of knowledge on the effectiveness of alternative forms of teacher education and teaching practice. One alternative form of teacher education and teaching practice is whole language. Based on a reflective approach to pedagogy, whole language is gathering momentum in scholarly discourse. Other than indications that there are some teachers using forms of whole language in schools, however, little is known about the practice of whole language in public schools. No research has been done that has looked at the socialization of student teachers with a whole language prospective.

In an effort to help fill in these gaps in the research, this study looks at the socialization process of six elementary student teachers who have adopted the teaching perspectives of whole language in a variety of placement sites. The six candidates were specifically chosen for their high potential for pursuing a whole language teaching perspective (See "Sample Selection" p. 38). The methodology associated with "interpretive field studies" (See Chapter Two) is used as a way of understanding the complexity of the socialization process in the field.

The following questions guided this research study: 1) To what extent does the whole language philosophy that these student teachers adopted influence their teaching practices? 2) What do these student teachers find in their student teaching environments, and how do they contend with it? and 3) What are the key factors which enable and constrain these student teachers as they go about teaching students from a whole language perspective?

Given the orientation of the research goals and questions that drive this study, a methodology is needed that can tap into the complex nature of the social world of student teachers. The next chapter will outline such a methodology.

End Notes

1. Other examples of direct skills training can be seen in Hunter's mastery teaching (1982) and Good & Grouws' active teaching (1975).

2. The prescribed curriculum is looked at as preexisting in the form of curriculum guides and teachers' manuals. Moreover, the content in the prescribed curriculum has been broken down into discrete chunks of information and sequenced to make the delivery easier and supposedly more palatable for student learning.

3. An ERIC search revealed over seven times (124 versus 16) as many articles have been written on whole language during the years between 1983-1989 than between the years 1976-1982.

4. The term "commercially produced materials" is a term used by Patrick Shannon (1987) to signify all of the materials that go into making a basal reading series: readers, teacher's manuals, workbooks, work sheets, management component, competency tests, and skill kits.

5. Zeichner's analysis consisted of 20 specific studies that dealt with research efforts that had a focus on field experience and teacher development. The articles were all taken from two major refereed U.S. journals devoted primarily to teacher education: a) Journal of Teacher Education, 1976-1983; b) Action in Teacher Education, 1978-1983.

6. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) found the following four strategies: internalized adjustment, strategic compliance, successful strategic redefinition, and unsuccessful strategic redefinition. The only difference between Lacey's categories and Zeichner and Tabachnick's categories is their distinction between successful and unsuccessful redefinition. Goodman (1988) found the following five strategies: overt compliance (Lacey's internalized adjustment), critical compliance (Lacey's strategic compliance), accommodative resistance, resistant alteration, and transformative action (Lacey's strategic redefinition). Goodman's accomodative resistance refers to the tactic of resisting small incidental activities such as altering drill work. Resistance alteration is where student teachers altered significantly the content of the lessons taught.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY: AN INTERPRETIVE FIELD WORK APPROACH

The questions proposed to guide this study require a set of methods with the potential for tapping into the actual experiences of student teachers. According to Burgess (1985), "It is vital that some consideration be given to the kinds of methods that are appropriate for particular research problems and the ways in which different research techniques may be used alongside each other to obtain different types of data" (p.3).

Another important consideration before making decisions on which methods to use is to examine the theoretical assumptions one holds regarding the nature of the social world under study and the nature of research. Lincoln and Guba (1985, pp. 33-44) argue that the following five axioms or basic beliefs undergird all research and need to be answered: 1) What is the nature of reality? 2) What is the relationship of knower to the known? 3) What is the possibility of generalization? 4) What is the possibility of causal linkages? and 5) How do values guide the research? The methodological stance researchers take depends, to a large extent, on how they answer these five axioms.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodological framework that will guide the research. First, the theoretical positions taken in this research regarding Lincoln and Guba's (1985) five axioms and their implications on how the research is conducted will be

examined. The characteristics of the adopted methodology will then be outlined, followed by a detailed description of the methods that were used to collect the data.

Theoretical Framework

The Nature of Reality

The reality found in the world of everyday life is socially constructed. In explaining the notion of the social construction of reality, Berger and Luckmann (1967) state: "Everyday life presents itself as a reality interpreted by men and subjectively meaningful to them as a coherent world" (p. 19). Because reality is interpreted by each individual, researchers must "get inside of the defining process of the actor in order to understand his actions" (Blumer, 1969; p. 16). For example, two student teachers might be observed teaching reading similarly; however, it cannot be assumed that the two individuals attribute the same meaning to their actions. Thus, Erickson (1986) argues that social research must attend to how different individuals interpret similar behavior because "different humans make sense differently" (p. 127).

The Relationship of Knower to Known

The researcher and the informant interact to influence one another. Instead of looking at this interactive relationship as detrimental to the validity of the findings, the dialogical relationship between researcher and informant should be looked at as beneficial; the researcher and the informant can fruitfully learn together (Lincoln & Guba,

1986). Spradly (1979) urges that researchers should not collect data about people but, instead, strive "to learn from people, to be taught by them" (p. 4). Establishing rapport with informants and developing their trust is vital to the success of the research study (Erickson, 1986; Spradley, 1979; Ball, 1985). As Erickson (1986) notes:

> Trust and rapport in field work are not simply a matter of niceness; a noncoercive, mutually rewarding relationship with key informants is essential if the researcher is to gain valid insights into the informant's point of view. (p. 142)

The Possibility of Generalization

The findings attributed to this study cannot be automatically generalized to other situations because human actions are time- and context-bound. These limitations, however, do not preclude the possibility of applying the findings to other settings if a detailed description of the context is given. Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that the reader must take an active part in applying the findings from the research. This means that the researcher's job becomes that of providing a thick descriptive account, giving the reader a "vicarious experience" of the phenomenon under investigation.

According to Erickson (1986), the purpose behind research is not generalizability but rather what he calls "particularizability." By attending to the details of the concrete case at hand, the researcher can provide insight into "what is broadly universal, what generalizes to other similar situations" (p. 130). Since the thrust of the

research is understanding particular cases, the sample selection does not have to be composed of a representative population; atypical samples can be studied. For example, this study looks at a select group of student teachers who have "high potential" for resisting the dominant patterns that exist in schools.

Possibility of Causal Linkages

No one factor is totally responsible for the actions of individuals. There are multiple factors that simultaneously shape the behaviors of individuals. In describing the idea of "mutual simultaneous shaping," Lincoln and Guba (1985) state:

> Everything influences everything else,in the here and now. Many elements are implicated in any given action, and each element interacts with all of the others in ways that change them all while simultaneously resulting in something that we, as outside observers, label as outcomes or effects. (p. 151)

Research that delves into the social world must take into account the complexity found there (Popkewitz, 1984). As mentioned in the first chapter, there are numerous factors that impact on the socialization of student teachers; it is necessary to recognize this fact and use instruments (e.g., the human instrument) that can capture such complexity.

The Role of Values

All research is value-bound (Magoon, 1977; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Popkewitz, 1984; Spradly, 1979; Saran, 1984).

Speaking to the importance of values, Magoon (1977) gives the following advice to researchers:

> Educational researchers need to take constructions of participants and their own more or less implicit constructs very seriously if the discipline is to be reasonably comprehensive and self-critical as a scientific endeavor. Since values have a significant impact on what is seen by researchers, an attempt should always be made to articulate these as part of any research activity. (p. 688)

Values influence researchers at many levels. The methodological stance the researcher takes is heavily influenced by the values s/he holds toward the five axioms. Another level of values concerns those of the researcher toward the subject matter under investigation. Saran (1984), for instance, admits that the problems she selects for study are influenced by what she values as worthy of study. The value stance of the researcher will also influence the way data are interpreted. For example, data collected from this study indicated instances of teacher resistance. This researcher categorized this finding as a positive teacher attribute, whereas another researcher might look at this conduct as subversive and categorize it as a negative teacher attribute. Another level of values is what Lincoln and Guba (1985) call "general cultural values," meaning that the researcher must be aware of the underlying values that impact on the contexts under study. It is important to consider not only the micro-level values (e.g., cooperating teacher, student teacher, students) that effect the classroom but also the macro-level values (e.g., state-mandated testing) that effect the classroom. Regarding the

micro-macro issue, Hammersley (1986) advises researchers to ask themselves the following question:

> Can social events be best explained by appeal to features of the local situation in which they occur, current or historical, or is it necessary to appeal to larger scale causes, such as the nature of the national, or even international, context in which they are located? (p. xvi)

The values embedded in the proposed research include a belief that teachers need to be actively involved with the curriculum and instruction that transpires in classrooms. In addition, the philosophy of whole language is considered a better way of teaching reading than the technocratic approach that so dominates school curricula today. Therefore, this research sought to document instances of student teacher resistance to the technical forms of classroom instruction so as to inform teacher education programs about the value of reflective forms of pedagogy.

Characteristics of Interpretive Field Work

A variety of names may be used to describe methodologies that embody those positions taken toward the five axioms (e.g., naturalistic--Lincoln and Guba 1985, interpretive--Erickson, 1986; qualitative methods--Burgess, 1985). Drawing upon all of these writers as well as others, this study will use the name "interpretive field work" as a way to distinguish itself.

The characteristics of interpretive field work are summarized by the following work from Burgess (1985, pp. 8-9) and Lincoln and Guba (1985, pp. 39-43):

1. The researcher works in a natural setting.

2. Studies may be designed and redesigned.
3. The research is concerned with social processes and with meaning.
4. Data collection and data analysis occur simultaneously.
5. The primary instrument used to gather data is the human instrument.
6. Qualitative methods such as interviewing, observation, and mining available documents and records are valued over quantitative methods.
7. The use of purposive or theoretical sampling.
8. The use of grounded theory.
9. The meaning attributed to the data will undergo negotiation and interpretation with the help of the informants.
10. The final report will take the form of a "thick descriptive" case study.
11. Any generalizations will be tentative.
12. The initial focus of the research will determine the focus.
13. A special criteria for trustworthiness will be used.

The Sample Selection

Purposeful sampling (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; & Patton, 1980) has been used to identify those student teachers who were used as informants for this study. Patton (1980) explains that purposeful sampling is most effective or best used when "one wants to learn something and come to understand something about certain select cases without needing to generalize to all such cases" (p. 100). Informants have been selected in the following manner. An initial pool of sixteen candidates was gathered by going into the language arts methods course that pre-service teachers take prior to their student teaching assignment and asking for volunteers who would be willing to participate in the study. From that initial pool, interviews were conducted to determine those students who had a high degree of commitment and a well-informed understanding of the philosophy of whole language.

The interviews delved into a variety of topics associated with whole language instruction: the kinds of whole language instruction, if any, they saw themselves using in the student teaching experience; when (right away, after they feel comfortable with the routines of teaching, at the end?) they planned on using whole language strategies for teaching children; the ways that they think children learn to read and write; and in what kinds of situations (only if the cooperating teacher used whole language instruction, only if the cooperating teacher said it was okay, or no matter what?) they would attempt to use whole language instruction (see Appendix A for interview questions).

One consideration for inclusion in the final sample was diversity in the backgrounds of student teachers and their placement sites. Differences in marital status, gender, ethnic backgrounds, ages, placement sites, and grade levels were sought. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967, p. 56), by allowing for as many differences as possible, a wider range of data will be uncovered. Lincoln and Guba state that "[t]he object of the game is not to focus on the similarities that can be developed into generalizations, but to detail the many specifics that give the context its unique flavor" (p. 201).

In addition to using interviews and looking for as much diversity as possible, the college instructors who taught these pre-service students whole language instruction were

asked to rate the candidate's commitment to and understanding of the principles of whole language. Their ratings were combined with the information gathered during the interviews and the diversity they displayed in their backgrounds and placement sites to help select the top six candidates. Before final selections were established, entry was gained to their placement sites, and permission was obtained from their university supervisors.

The six student teachers chosen as informants were all white females.[1] There is diversity, however, in placement sites, age ranges, and grade levels.[2] Of the six informants, four were chosen as "key informants,"--Jane, Karen, Linda, and Carol--and the other two--Paula and Rita--were used as "ancillary informants" (Dobbert, 1982). The key informants were more intensely studied than the ancillary group, supplying the majority of the data.

There are several reasons for using both key informants and ancillary informants. First was the limitations of time. Student teaching lasts for only one semester, leaving sixteen weeks for data collection. In order to do an in-depth study of student teachers, a reasonable limit on the number of informants had to be set. Limiting the size of the study group, however, cut down on the diversity needed to broaden the range of data. Therefore, an ancillary group offered diversity in both the background characteristics of the student teacher and the placement sites. Lastly, because there was less time commitment on the part of the

ancillary informants, both Rita and Paula (the two ancillary informants in the study) were willing to participate in the study.

Logistics: Schedule of Observations and Interviews

The amount of time spent in the field was approximately 108 hours. All of the key informants were visited at least seven times and at least twenty hours were spent observing each of them at their placement sites. Three observations, averaging approximately one and a half hours, were done with the ancillary informants.[3] During most observations, interviews with the informants were also conducted. If interviews could not take place during the times observations were made, phone interviews were conducted within five days. Since observations of ancillary informants were limited, each ancillary informant was interviewed six times during her student teaching. Observations and interviews were intentionally spread out over the course of the student teaching experience so as to sample what life was like for student teachers at different stages of their student teaching experience (beginning, middle, end). Moreover, observations were purposely staggered so as to watch each key informant at different times of the day and different days of the week. Some visits consisted of observing a single lesson, and other visits consisted of observing an entire day. By staggering the time of the day, the amount of time spent on a particular visit, the day of the week, and the different

stages of their student teaching, a wide selection of classroom life was witnessed. Because of this, a more comprehensive understanding of the informants' experiences was obtained.

Methods of Data Collection

The primary methods used for gathering data for this study were interviews, observations, and examination of relevant documents. The primary instrument used for gathering data was the human instrument (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Since most of the data gathered were hidden in the constructed realities of the informants and in the tacit assumptions they held, only the human instrument can decipher those constructed meanings, sort out the subtleties that events and occurrences bring, and interpret those meanings for human informants participating within subjective environments.

Data collection began during the spring semester of 1989, when initial interviews of perspective informants were conducted; however, most of the data were gathered during the fall semester of 1989, while the selected sample of informants were doing their student teaching.

The primary mode of collecting and saving data was through recording audio tapes. Initial and early interviews were recorded on audio tapes to help provide a large selection of statements that the researcher used for generating and supporting later questions (Spradley, 1979). Furthermore, recording early interviews helped provide

feedback for the researcher to judge the quality of the interviews. Most later interviews--except final interviews and phone interviews--and all observations were recorded through field notes. Guba and Lincoln (1985, p. 272) list the following five advantages of field notes: 1) they are not as threatening to a respondent as a recording, 2) the process of taking notes keeps the investigator alert and responsive, 3) field notes are not subject to technical difficulties that beset recordings, 4) they provide ready access to the investigator who may wish to return to an earlier point and refresh his/her memory, and 5) they allow the researcher to record his/her own interpretations and thoughts of what is going on.

Classroom observations began the first week of student teaching.[4] The purpose of such observations was to explore the cooperating teachers' methods of instruction, the type of interactions that occurred between students and teachers, and the way the classroom was organized. Classroom observations continued during the time when the student teacher was responsible for classroom instruction.

The purpose of observing the student teacher in action was to provide the researcher with "here-and-now experiences in depth" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 273). By observing actual instances of what was going on in the classroom, this researcher learned much about the student teacher's perspective of teaching that interviewing alone could not reveal. First, the researcher collected an assortment of

examples that depicted the kinds of instruction that the student teacher engaged the class in. These were then interpreted by the researcher to have certain meanings. Later, the student teacher was asked to evaluate her performance. It was by this process of observing and interviewing that the researcher began to tap into the tacit knowledge that was otherwise hidden from the conscious awareness of the student teacher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

According to Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), the researcher can take on one of several different roles: complete participant, participant as observer, observer as participant, and complete observer. In discussing which role to adopt, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) state the following:

> Decisions about the role to adopt in a setting will depend on the purpose of the research and the nature of the setting. In any case, anticipation of the likely consequences of adopting different roles can rarely be more than speculative. Fortunately, shifts in roles can often be made over the course of field work. Indeed, there is strong arguments in favor of moving among roles so as to allow one to discount their effects on data. (p. 97)

Since the primary focus during observation in this research was on the lived experiences of the student teacher, this researcher tended to be more of an observer than a participant. As Schwartz & Schwartz (1969) point out, however, the mere presence of a researcher within the research setting implies that s/he is a part of that setting, thus, participating to a certain degree. With this

in mind, in most instances, the role this researcher took on was that of observer as participant.

Interviews were conducted throughout the study and served many purposes. Lincoln and Guba (1985, pp. 268-269) give five different purposes for interviews which were all applied in this study. First, they are a means of obtaining the here-and-now constructions of the informants. Second, during interviews the informants can recall pertinent past events that the researcher has not been privy to and describe these events and the meanings that the informants attributed to them. Third, through interviews informants can fantasize about future situations and predict their responses. Fourth, the interview can allow the researcher to verify data collected from other sources. Finally, the interview can provide a means for the informant to verify, amend, and extend the categories that the researcher has uncovered.

Both formal and informal interviews were conducted throughout the study. The formal interview differed from the informal interview in that a scheduled time was prearranged for the former, while the later occurred at any time throughout the study. Moreover, the formal interview had a longer list of questions and topics for the informants to discuss, causing a considerably longer time for completion. Despite the differences noted above, both kinds of interviews resembled "a series of friendly conversations in which the researcher slowly introduces new elements to

assist informants to respond as informants" (Spradly, 1979, p. 58).

The interview process corresponded to the following three phases outlined by Guba and Lincoln (1985): 1) orientation and overview phase, 2) focused exploration phase, and 3) member check phase. The orientation phase began by asking general, open-ended questions that resemble what Spradly (1979) calls "grand tour" questions. Questions such as, "What are some reasons you have for going into teaching?", "What are some of the language arts activities that you taught in your field experiences?", and "What is your vision of the ideal classroom?" allowed the informant to "warm up" and, at the same time, provided valuable information about the informant's teaching philosophy. The data that were gathered in the orientation phase were then analyzed and served as the basis for the second phase which was a more focused exploration. Questions were asked such as, "In what ways is your ideal classroom and your cooperating teachers' classroom similar and/or different?", "To what degree was the curriculum in your placement site controlled by the state mandated test?", "What was your perception of the students' reaction to whole language activities?" The third phase, member check, invited the informant to validate and extend the categories that were being uncovered.

Student teachers were the primary focus during the interview process. However, cooperating teachers,

university supervisors, building principals, the directors of student teaching, and college instructors were also interviewed. Information obtained from these individuals served three purposes. First, by having additional sources of information, steps could be taken to triangulate, or validate, what was being said (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). Secondly, multiple sources allowed for disparate views to emerge. These challenges led to further questions, which resulted in new interpretations. Thirdly, the additional sources provide valuable information that extended the understanding of student teaching and gave insight into the various influences that effect the student teacher.

Interviews were conducted with the supervising teachers and the university supervisors to help provide information on the kind of language arts instruction they valued and the expectations they had of the student teacher. Building principals were asked what expectations they had for the teaching of language arts in their building. Moreover, they were asked what factors from the community and the state impact upon language arts instruction in the classroom. College instructors who had taught the student teachers language arts methods were asked to explain details of their program. Additionally, the informants' social studies methods instructors were interviewed because of the significance of this course in helping shape the informants' whole language perspectives. The directors for student teaching were interviewed to understand the way in which the

student teaching program was carried out and the purposes behind student teaching.

The examination of relevant documents was another source of data collection. Student teacher lesson plans, work sheets designed for students, dittoed messages sent home to parents, and commercially produced teacher manuals were used to embellish what was learned through observations and interviews.

It is well to keep in mind that data collecting methods can not be separated from analysis. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) state:

> In other words, data collection and analysis are inextricably linked in ethnography because the ethnographer may not know what questions to ask until initial impressions and perceptions have been analyzed and tentative conclusions have been formulated (p. 105).

Therefore, although data collection and analysis were treated as separate categories here, they occurred simultaneously.

Data Analysis

In explaining the purpose for data analysis, Ball (1983) points out, "The analysis of case study data is essentially concerned with the process of interpretation. That is, the translation of raw data into a coherent portrayal of an institution and institutional process" (p. 79). Spradly (1979) speaks to the purpose of data analysis saying, "The ethnographer wants to discover patterns of meaning in what an informant says. This requires constant analysis of utterances, taking them apart

to find the tacit relationships and patterns" (p. 53). Furthermore, Spradly (1979) points out that "analysis will enable you to discover questions to ask in future interviews. It will also lead to finding out what things mean to your informant" (p. 92). Data analysis was the means towards discovering categories (patterns) of meaning. These categories of meaning emerged from the data; therefore, a constant comparison of new data with existing data was essential.

It is a method discussed by Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985. In this method comparisons begin with an analysis of the initial data and continue throughout the entire period of data collection and analysis. Categories of meaning began to emerge from initial data and gave focus to later data collection. With more data collection and analysis, the properties that made up the categories become further delineated and better understood.

It is important to note that since the categories that did emerge had to be interpreted (discovered) by the researcher, his biases as well as those of the informants had to be continuously explored (Schwartz & Schwartz, 1969). By having multiple sources for data generation, there was ample opportunity for cross-checking of data. Special attention was paid to any disparate data that challenged existing categories. As Spradly (1979) warns, "We especially want to avoid imposing categories from the

outside that create order and pattern rather than discover it" (p. 93).

In an effort to be more systematic with data collection and analysis, field notes were analyzed prior to the next observation and/or interview with the informant. This analysis of field notes was conducted by first reading over the field notes and then coming up with several broad categories (headings) to help the researcher distinguish what was being observed. For example, during an observation of one of the informants, the following headings were used: "cooperating teacher teaching reading, description of learning centers found throughout room, reading group that student teacher taught, and miscellaneous" (field notes from observation of Linda 10/2/89). Once these notes were done, the researcher dictated the field notes under these headings into a cassette recorder. Later these recordings were transcribed. During the course of this process, categories as well as questions that the researcher wanted to pursue emerged. These were then written down in the researcher's reflexive journal and used later to help further delineate the categories that were emerging and to guide future interviews. At first, the properties of the categories were loosely defined, but as further data collection and analysis proceeded, the properties that define the categories were better and better understood.

Trustworthiness and Authenticity

In order to measure the "goodness" of research using a qualitative paradigm, Lincoln and Guba (1986) have proposed the concepts of trustworthiness and authenticity.

According to Guba (1981) there are four components to trustworthiness: 1) credibility, 2) transferability, 3) dependability, and 4) confirmability. Each of these components is used as a criterion for making sure that the findings are genuine and will be worth noting.

Certain techniques were used in this study to help ensure the trustworthiness of the research. To help ensure the credibility component, the use of prolonged engagement (understanding the context) and persistent observation (significant amount of time in the field) were used. The study was conducted over the entire semester in which the student teachers were engaged in their student teaching. As mentioned previously, data collection was done on a regular basis for the entire time the student teachers were engaged in their student teaching. Prior to the data collection in the fall of 1989, this researcher had spent three semesters as a university supervisor. The experience gained during these three semesters oriented this researcher towards understanding the expectations, routines, and procedures that student teachers face during their experience. Because of the familiarity the researcher had with the student teaching experience, data that otherwise would have been

hidden in the subtleties of the context were more easily detected and recorded.

The use of a peer debriefer was another means of ensuring the credibility of the research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe the peer debriefer as "a disinterested professional peer to keep the inquirer honest, assist in developing working hypotheses, develop and test emerging design, and obtain emotional catharsis" (p. 77). Every two weeks a graduate student familiar with qualitative research meet with the researcher and served as the peer debriefer.[5]

Finally, the use of the techniques of triangulation and member checking which have already been described were used and provided additional means for satisfying the credibility component.

A reflexive journal was kept for two purposes: to serve as a means of reflecting on any thoughts and/or insights that came up during the data collection stage and to serve as a methodological log in which methodological decisions and accompanying rationales were recorded. The methodological log served as the means for what Guba and Lincoln (1985) have termed the "audit trail." The audit trail is the establishment of documented evidence about methodological choices that demonstrate dependability and confirmability. In addition to the methodological log, the researcher met with two consultants[6] who were familiar with interpretive methodologies on a biweekly basis. The purposes of the meetings were to share the data that were

being collected, to examine the methods and strategies employed for collecting and analyzing data, and to offer suggestions to assist the researcher in the collecting and analyzing of the data.

To establish transferability, the last component of Guba and Lincoln's trustworthiness criteria, the final report provided "thick" descriptive data of the participants and the contexts in which their actions were carried out. Transfer, therefore, will be left to the reader who, by way of the thick description, will decide if the findings are relative to his/her situation as s/he knows it.

Authenticity is described by Guba and Lincoln (1985) as that set of criteria inherent in qualitative methodologies that are based on a relativist ontology and an interactive, value-bounded epistemology. They list five criteria for establishing this methodological authenticity: fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity, and tactical authenticity.

The fairness criteria is by far the most discussed criteria of the five. Fairness is defined as making sure the research maintains a balanced view that presents all participants' constructions and the values that undergird them. Moreover, fairness means that participants have input every step of the way on the interpretations that are being made. The other four criteria seek to help the informants and the researcher arrive at a richer understanding of the world (ontological authenticity), gain an appreciation for

the views and beliefs of others (educative authenticity), stimulate positive actions on the part of the informants and researcher (catalytic authenticity), and empower informants to view themselves not as subjects to be manipulated but as collaborators who are in control of the direction of the research (tactical authenticity).

To help meet these five criteria, the following steps were taken: 1) the researcher maintained an attitude of equality between himself and the participants; 2) each participant signed a consent form (that spelled out the rules of the research) stating they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time; 3) member checking was a continuous process that occurred at all stages (data collection, analysis of data, and writing of report) of the research; and 4) the written report was made available for inspection by all participants, at which time they were invited to correct any inaccuracies in the written report. In addition, the informants' reactions to Chapters Three, Four, and Five are given at the end of the chapters.

In this chapter an explanation of the study's methodological stance was done, including the theoretical framework, the sample selection process, the methods used to collect and analyze data, and ways to increase the trustworthness and authenticity of the study. The next chapter will provide a description of how the key informants manifested their whole language perspective in the daily activities of student teaching.

End Notes

1. The initial pool of 16 candidates consisted of all white females.

2. Linda (key informant)--married, age 38, small rural school, second grade; Jane (key informant)--single, age 23, mid-sized city school, third grade; Karen (key informant)--single, age 20, large inner-city school, third grade; Carol (key informant) single, age 21, mid-sized city school, fifth grade; Paula (ancillary informant)--married, age 40, mid-sized city school, second grade; Rita (ancillary informant)--married, age 21, mid-sized city school, sixth grade.

3. Of the two ancillary informants, Rita and Paula, only Paula was observed because Rita's cooperating teacher would not allow the researcher inside her classroom.

4. In most cases during these early observations the student teacher was observing and the cooperating teacher was teaching since the university has outlined a program for the student teacher to be an observer the first two week.

5. Bruce Robbins, who is familiar with qualitative research (has taken Egon Guba's Y611 course), agreed to act as the peer debriefer.

6. The director of this research, Jesse Goodman, and the chairman of this research, Norm Overly, served as the consultants.

CHAPTER THREE

MANIFESTING A WHOLE LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVE IN THE CLASSROOM

In their research on student teachers, Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) define perspectives as "the way teachers thought about their work (e.g., purposes, goals, conceptions of children, curriculum) and the ways in which they gave meaning to these beliefs by their behavior in the classroom" (p. 28). A study of beginning teachers by Goodman (1988) found that although beginning teachers expressed similar beliefs verbally, the way in which they manifested these beliefs varied substantially. This study used the construct "perspectives" as stated by Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) to gain an understanding of how the informants manifested their whole language philosophy. Chapter three focuses on the key informants' teaching practices during their student teaching and seeks to understand what it means to teach from a whole language orientation.

The five categories used earlier (See Figure 1) to distinguish between technocratic teaching practices and reflective teaching practices (existing school practices, knowledge, curriculum, concept of teacher, and concept of student) will be used to help delineate the perspectives of these student teachers. It should be pointed out, however, that these categories are not mutually exclusive; overlap occurs between categories so that many of the examples used to describe one category could also be used in describing

another category. For example, these student teachers worked towards making the curriculum activity-centered. They also conceived of students as being active agents in their own learning. Consequently, examples depicting their perspectives of curriculum could also be used to describe their perspectives toward students or vice versa.

It must be noted that only data from the key informants--Jane, Karen, Carol, and Linda--are used in this chapter because actual observations of ancillary informants were too limited. Furthermore, perspectives of these student teachers was not solely influenced by their pre-service methods courses in whole language. There were other significant factors influencing their perspectives, such as a social studies methods course and their own personal preferences towards certain teaching styles (more of this will be discussed in Chapter 5). However, whole language philosophy was the dominant force in shaping these women's perspectives and best exemplifies what their visions of classroom life should be like. Finally, although each of these key informant's perspectives can be placed in the categories that follow, the commitment they had to their beliefs and the way they chose to manifest their beliefs varied. For example, both Jane and Karen talked about a process approach to learning.

> Jane: "Writing is a process. Students need to learn that authors don't just sit down and pull something off" (interview with Jane 12/18/89).
>
> Karen: "I just started watching other teachers who sat back and waited for the finished product. I'm more

interested in what they are thinking" (interview with Karen 11/21/89).

Although both Jane and Karen are obviously concerned with the process of learning, Jane focused more on the process of learning in regard to writing than did Karen. In fact, Jane used the metaphor "authoring cycle," a term she learned in her language arts methods class, several times to help illustrate her vision of whole language. Jane chose to have the students write, edit, and publish their own stories, a project she worked on over a period of weeks. In comparison, Karen mentioned the authoring cycle once during her initial interviews prior to student teaching but did not mention it after she started her student teaching, nor did she attempt to initiate it during her student teaching experience.

Existing School Practices

Each of the key informants took a critical stance towards existing school practices, particularly the narrow technocratic logic of language arts instruction. Seeing existing school practices as problematic was evident in their thinking prior to their student teaching:

> Karen: The kids [she observed in field experiences] don't know all the time why they are doing exercises. The exercises that they are doing are often times not even talked about, and they don't even know why they are doing them, and that bothers me. (interview with Karen prior to student teaching 4/4/89)

> Jane: I think it [the basal program she observed in a classroom] is dry. I don't think I can sit down and tell children that they have to read a certain book that interests me and not them. I don't think that works well at all; it's not the most beneficial way. (interview with Jane prior to student teaching 3/28/89)

> Linda: They [students in the class that Linda observed] just rotate reading one paragraph at a time, and they are told, "Today you write down this sentence and then this sentence." The kids told me that they hated reading round robin like that and doing workbook pages. (interview with Linda prior to student teaching 3/23/89)

> Carol: The basal work sheets I've seen have stuff like c_t and b_t on the page. The kids only had to write the letter 'a' all the way down their page. They were really not learning anything new; they were just doing the pages. (interview with Carol prior to student teaching 4/26/89)

Once the key informants got to their placement sites, their criticism of technocratic teaching practices continued whenever they saw it show up in commercially produced textbooks and/or the methods of instruction that their cooperating teachers demonstrated. The severity of their criticisms depended on two factors: 1) to what degree their placement sites were dominated by the technocratic ideology, and 2) to what degree they saw themselves being trapped into teaching practices that went against their whole language perspective.

Karen, whose placement site's curriculum was the most heavily controlled by technocratic ideology, voiced harsh criticisms of her cooperating teacher:

> I sit and listen to her [cooperating teacher] going over these vocabulary words from the reading books, and I'll loose my train of thought, and then I hear her start yelling at some kids, "What did I say?" I myself couldn't answer that question because my mind has started to wander, too. So I'm constantly thinking how am I going to remember this when I teach? How can I make it more exciting or meaningful for them? (interview with Karen Sept. 25)

Karen's criticisms continued as her student teaching experience progressed. As she was forced into a teaching style that resembled her cooperating teacher's, Karen began to focus her criticisms away from her cooperating teacher and more on the commercially produced textbooks and the policies of the school in which she was placed.

> There seemed to be so many of these skill things that need to be covered for each story. There were at least five reading skills that went along with the story, three dittos for each skill. Three weeks go by and you have read one story. . .the book [the commercially produced social studies book] was really stupid; it is called communities, and the first part of it, the one that I dealt with, was about maps, and the book did a narrow coverage of it, I did a lot more with it. . . .The third graders that I had don't need the kind of busy work we gave them for homework [in reference to the school policy of four homework assignments per week], a lot of them don't even need to do it. . . . (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

Jane, on the other hand, whose cooperating teacher's perspective resembled Jane's whole language perspective, voiced few criticisms. Jane had nothing but praise for her cooperating teacher at the beginning of her experience: "She is my idea of a perfect teacher" (interview with Jane 10/6/90). As Jane started to resume more responsibility for the classroom teaching, however, she began to voice mild criticisms toward some of the instructional materials that were being used, particularly the commercially produced skill books. "I don't think the kids are doing very well on them [skill books], and I don't think I'll use them when I become a teacher" (interview with Jane 10/16/90).

Knowledge and Learning

Each of the key informants saw personal knowledge as being valuable and attempted to allow children to interpret the knowledge they had acquired based on their prior learning. Linda exemplified this value towards personal knowledge during a lesson in which the students, doing an assignment in comparisons, were to fill in the correct answer in the following sentence: A toad (can, cannot) swim as well as a frog. One second grade boy circled "can" because he had a pet toad and had seen it swim faster than any frog he had ever known. Listening intently to this student explain his reasoning, Linda said, "I'll tell you what; you put down what you think, and I'll grade it that way" (observation of Linda 10/2/89).

Many of the assignments that the student teachers gave to students reflected their personal, interpretive notion of knowledge. Carol, for example, gave many open-ended assignments in which she had students use their imaginations to come up with a finished product. One assignment Carol gave was to have a student illustrate chapter one in the trade book s/he was reading. Carol [to student]: "If you had to illustrate the first chapter, how would you do it?" (observation of Carol 10/6/89). Moreover, Carol made special attempts to have students relate their assignments to things in their everyday lives. During a "book talk" in which students were to share the book they had read with their classmates, Carol encouraged a pair of students who

wanted to report like the television film critics Siskel and Ebert. "It [the book talk] was good because they were trying to use things they see on television and actually learn something with it" (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

All these student teachers viewed knowledge as much more valuable when it was presented in whole forms rather than in fragmented pieces. Karen explained the futility of the fragmented, skills approach, "I don't know how they can enjoy the story when it is cut up into vocabulary at the beginning and all those skill sheets at the end" (interview with Karen 9/19/89). In one attempt to present material in a more wholistic form, Karen presented the growth stages of a butterfly in three different forms:

> It was from the first science chapter where it was stages of growth in the animals, and I gave each person a picture of one of the stages--I did a really good drawing of these. Then another group of students had the word egg, larva, butterfly, pupa, caterpillar, or butterfly. The final group had first stage, second stage, etc. I first had the group with the pictures come up and put them in order, which was the easiest thing to do because you can see the growth. Then I had the people with the numerical order put them in order, and finally I had the people with the term label them. Then we went over them. (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

The key informants viewed the process of obtaining knowledge to be just as important, if not more so, than the knowledge actually acquired. This emphasis on process was most evident in the way these student teachers taught writing. Jane, for example, worked at helping students view writing as a series of stages that would eventually lead to the finished product of a story book. Over a period of several weeks, Jane took the students through the following

five stages: 1) the students wrote a number of creative stories and compiled them in personal folders; 2) the students picked one of their favorite stories, and Jane met with them in small groups to discuss the meaning that the students had intended to express; 3) Jane showed all the students a chart of editing marks and had students work on editing their own stories; 4) Jane then had students work with a peer in order to help each other edit his/her story; 5) and finally, students copied their stories on paper, illustrated them, and made hard back covers out of cardboard and material so that they would resemble books (observations and interviews of Jane 11/8/89, 12/11/89, 12/20/89).

Linda also worked to help students see writing as more than a finished product. Linda explains an assignment that she designed for a group of students who were interested in turtles:

> [W]e [Linda and her cooperation teacher] are going to give them a format where it is kind of like in columns, and they have to fill in the information as they go. Each column will be expanded into sentences, which will make up paragraphs. They are going to need a lot of help on spelling. What I'm hoping we can do is let them do it and then show them how to correct for spelling and punctuation on their own and then have me correct it. Finally, students will make a final draft. (interview with Linda 8/30/89)

Linda made an effort to help students feel good about their writing and hopefully learn to like writing: "I never count off for misspelling or wrong forms of punctuation. I want writing to be a positive experience" (interview with Linda 10/23/90). Voicing similar sentiments, Carol explains her policy on the weekly journal assignments that she had

students do: "I read them, make comments, but I do not give them a grade. I don't even give them credit if they do it. It is just an activity" (interview with Carol 10/25/89)

There was a considerable effort on the part of the key informants to facilitate the social nature of learning, that is, learning which is promoted through interactions with others. Because they looked at learning as a social affair, each student teacher emphasized group work as a part of the daily classroom activities. Carol expressed the reasons she valued group work:

> . . .so that they could learn from each other and work with each other. Not only were they learning actual material; they were also learning some social skills--how to work together, and I think that is really important. I think there are a lot of really bright people who cannot work with others, and this is something they need to be able to do. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

Most of the activities Carol assigned to students were done in pairs or with groups, such as her idea of reading partners. Students chose a partner, selected a book, discussed it, and then planned a presentation they could give to the class. One pair of partners, Joel and Andrew, seemed to complement each other well. Joel was a capable reader who had read a wide variety of books. Andrew, on the other hand, was not a good reader and seldom read (observation of Carol 10/6/89). "Joel helped Andrew see that you <u>can</u> [emphasis added] finish a book; you can actually sit down and finish a book" (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

During a reading lesson, Linda had students write a story. After the children composed their rough drafts, Linda had them read their stories aloud to the group. She encouraged the students to help each other add to their stories by asking, "How can we help her add some words to her story" (observation of Linda 10/2/89). Commenting on the importance of helping each other with their learning, Linda explained, "They [the students] have to know that not only are they valuable as someone [sic] who creates but that they can help mold other people" (interview with Linda 12/1/89).

Curriculum

There were several different ways in which the key informants' whole language perspectives shaped the way they viewed curriculum. One of the major influences was how they found potential in all subjects for contributing to language arts instruction. Karen, who had little opportunity to make curricular decisions when teaching reading to her third graders, used science as a way to teach language arts. Working on an animal unit, Karen established a small library of books about the different animals the class was studying. While teaching the science lesson, Karen made reference to these books and allowed students to look through the books on their free time (observation of Karen 9/11/89). In a science lesson dealing with endangered animals, Karen had pairs of students researching two questions she gave them concerning such animals. Students went through the

different animal books, using the index to help guide their research, and took notes when they found information that answered the questions. The students were then asked to refer to their notes while discussing the topic of endangered animals and what mankind was doing to help save them (observation of Karen 10/17/90).

Linda also used science as a means to integrate language arts into the curriculum. She did a unit on turtles. As a way to broaden the students understanding about turtles, Linda established a "text set"--five books on turtles in a small box. She placed the text set in the back of the room where students freely looked through them during their spare time (observation of Linda 8/29/89). Linda eventually established a learning center where she would have different animal books on display. Her second grade students went to the center to research the particular animal they were studying. One week the learning center had a book on snakes. Students were to look through the book and come up with at least one snake fact that they could later share with the class (observation of Linda 9/19/89). To go along with their research on snakes, Linda had students make snake puppets. Students used their snake puppets as props while singing a song that Linda taught them entitled "Sneaky Snake." The students later sang and acted out their puppet show at a school assembly (observation of Linda 10/23/89).

Combining language arts with different subjects was not the only way the key informants defined integration. They also attempted to use a thematic approach in curricular planning, tying together different subject areas with a particular theme. Carol explains her position on whether or not to distinguished one subject from another: "I think that I would like just to call it school [not different subject areas]. We are here in school today, and everything is integrated together" (interview with Carol 4/26/89). Carol used the themes in several different ways while teaching her fifth graders. In one instance, the science unit that her cooperating teacher gave her to teach was on the classification of animals. Carol decided to arrange for students to take a trip to the zoo. While there, students were to find out information about a particular animal that they were interested in. Later they had to write a report on their animal (observation of Carol 10/13/89). Carol also connected the animal theme with the social studies unit she developed on the geographical regions of the United States. As part of their assignment during their study of the different regions, students had to identify the different animal species in the different regions (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

The key informants emphasized attempts to make the curriculum more context specific to the lives of their students. Karen, commenting on what she considered irrelevant assignments suggested by the commercially

produced teachers' manuals, noted, "It is scary what schools can do; we need to get kids to understand that learning is related to their life [sic]" (interview with Karen 9/19/89). Karen taught a lesson from the English book calling for students to sequence the order of events in a paragraph about the birth of puppies. Since her students had recently been trick-or-treating, Karen decided to alter the lesson to include something about Halloween. Instead of the students time-ordering the paragraph about the puppies, they were allowed to write a paragraph describing what they had done for Halloween from the time they came home after school to the time they went to bed (interview with Karen 11/30/89).

There were many attempts at making reading and writing more meaningful events for students. Jane, with the help of her cooperating teacher, spent a lot of time having students write letters to penpals, to each other, and to their teachers. Jane's cooperating teacher explained that through letter writing students could learn the various skills they needed and accomplish purposeful writing:

> We [Jane and I] were able to get at some skills they need to know for their state competency test with the letter writing. We got a lot of our skill work done without them [students] knowing it. Each time we wrote a letter, Jane or I would say, "Go back and fix this because of such and such." They got to hear it one-on-one, not from a work sheet that said so, but because you want to present your penpal with a letter that you can be proud of. (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89)

Besides the student teachers' attempts at providing a curriculum that was more contextualized to the lives of their pupils, they also stressed a curriculum responsive to

the needs and interests of their students. Carol, for example, believed that using trade books was a better way to teach reading than the commercially produced reading books that the school furnished for her fifth graders. David, a student whom Carol had earlier diagnosed with comprehension difficulties, (interview with Carol 10/6/89) was allowed to choose his own trade book. He chose a Choose Your Own Adventure Story and was reading independently for an extended period of time (observation of Carol 11/3/89). Carol explained, "He likes them [Choose Your Own Adventure Story books]. The next one he chooses, I told him to pick a harder one; he is working his way up. This is the best I've seen him read so far" (interview with Carol 11/3/89).

Observing that many of her students were getting into skirmishes during free time, a time when they were allowed to play games, Jane developed a learning center that instructed the students to do the following assignment:

> Most newspapers have an advice column. Pretend you are the advice columnist and write a solution to the following letter in your investigation notebooks: *There is a problem in our classroom. Several students enjoy the classroom, but there are not enough toys to go around. Our class fights over them. What should we do?* (observation of Jane 11/4/89)

Linda designed some learning activities for her second graders which were geared toward both capturing their interests as well as promoting important skills. One activity called for students to conduct a survey of their classmates on the most popular flower. The activity had a folder that Linda made with an assortment of flowers

pictured and labeled. Students conducting the survey showed the students being polled their choices, made the appropriate tallies, added up the tallies, and wrote up the results (observation of Linda 9/7/89). Another activity that Linda designed with the students' interests in mind was a pretend trip to a yard sale. Linda had many items she had cut out from magazines and catalogues such as ball gloves, dolls, sporting equipment, etc. Each of the items was pasted on a folder and had a price tag in dollars and cents. The students taking the fantasy trip to the yard sale had the following directions:

> *It is Saturday, and mom is going to a yard sale. You have one dollar from chores, two dollars from birthday money, and fifty cents from the tooth fairy. What will you buy and how much money will you have left over?* (observation of Linda 9/7/89)

The key informants viewed curriculum in which students actively participated as important. Linda explains her position about an activity-oriented curriculum. "I'm really into hands-on. . .I don't like to talk about it; I like to do it" (interview with Linda 12/1/89). Among other things, Linda had her second graders make puppets, sing songs, and make turtles out of clay. One time Linda was reading the book We're Back. In one scene, dinosaurs were somehow transported to the future, and the police were telling them to freeze. As she was reading the story, she had the kids get out of their seats to pretend they were the dinosaurs and instructed them to freeze (interview with Linda 12/1/89).

In the month of November, Jane decided that she would like to do something with Thanksgiving. After she discovered a high degree of student interest, Jane allowed her students to do a Thanksgiving play. Jane read seven different Thanksgiving stories and then had students vote on which one they wanted to act out. Jane worked on editing the one they chose in order to make it feasible material for a play. Students chose the characters they wanted to be, costumes were made, and parents were invited to the after school production. (observation of Jane 11/13/89).

The final way these student teachers' curricular perspectives were influenced by whole language philosophy involved their views on evaluation. They used several methods for evaluating students and saw evaluation as more than just a student's grade. Their evaluation served as a means for observing the progress of a student's total academic and social development.

Jane viewed the progress of individual students differently depending on their level of sophistication. On a writing assignment, for example, Jane accepted Mustafa's story but felt Russell should do his over, even though Russell's story was longer and more elaborate:

> For Mustafa, that was his best effort, and therefore, I will allow him to publish it, whereas Russell did something that he claimed was his best effort, but I didn't think that it was, so I talked to him about it and suggested that he do the assignment over. (interview with Jane 12/11/89)

In describing the criteria she used to determine Russell's effort as unacceptable and Mustafa's effort as acceptable,

Jane explains, "It really is a judgment call. When I suspect the students can do a better job, we have a conference and talk about it. You just have to know the students' writing and what they are capable of" (interview with Jane 12/11/89).

Like Jane, Karen determined progress through the observation of her third grade students. Mark was a student Karen described as immature and very reluctant to correct any of his work:

> I spent a lot of time talking to him [Mark]--how his attitude affected him and the F grades he was receiving. I told him he could be getting much better grades if he would fix the mistakes on his homework papers. One time Latasha, who sits very close to him, got a paper back that was done incorrectly, and I asked her to fix her mistakes. She said, "No." So Mark went over to her and told her it would help her if she would do it again, that she would get a good grade and would know how to do it next time. All these times I told Mark this, and I thought he was just blowing it off. He tried to coax her into doing her work, and that was really nice to see because maybe he really did believe in it if he is going to go over to another student and tell them [sic] that. (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

At a teachers' meeting that Carol attended, a discussion about evaluation took place. Many of the teachers at the meeting concluded that the best way to evaluate students was to use the diagnostic instruments from the commercially produced basal reading series. Carol recalls her agitation over these conclusions:

> I didn't want to say anything, but I couldn't help myself. Finally, I said, "Don't you think you can know your students better if you read books and discuss stories?" I guess they [teachers in attendance] don't trust their own judgment. (interview with Carol 10/6/89)

Carol used a variety of evaluation techniques such as using check lists, doing surveys, listening to students read, conducting individual conferences, keeping anecdotal records, and having students evaluate themselves. After a group of students had finished reading the trade book The Book of Three, Carol met with them for individual conferences.

> Carol: "Jodi, Did you like The Book of Three?"
> Jodi: "Yes, especially the part at the end."
> Carol: "Why did you like the end part?"
> Jodi: "Because I didn't know what was going to happen."
> Carol: "What letter grade do you think you deserve?"
> Jodi: "Probably a B."
> Carol shows Jodi a check list she was keeping that recorded all of the discussions and written assignments that Jodi had been involved with during The Book of Three project. Carol pointed out that Jodi's written work was far superior to her responses during discussions.
> Carol: "Anything that you could improve?"
> Jodi: "I could say more during discussions."
> Carol: "I think you deserve an A- or B+." (observation of Carol 10/6/89)

Carol believed that students needed to become involved in their own evaluation. She explains, "If they don't care about what they are doing, then they will not learn much" (interview with Carol 9/26/89).

Carol also relied on her recall of anecdotal incidents when talking to other teachers and to parents who wondered how individual students were doing. For example, one mother came in to discuss with Carol how her child, Thea, was doing. Carol recalled telling Thea's mother, "I know Thea is intelligent. She has some very good ideas. But she

isn't very organized. Every time I look at her desk, it is a mess" (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

Concept of Teachers

There was an overwhelming belief on the part of these student teachers that curriculum should be controlled by the classroom teacher and not from outside sources. Most of the activities that Linda did in science and social studies came from her own curricular materials and not from teacher's manuals or the school corporation's curricular guides. For instance, Linda taught a lesson with the intent of helping students become aware of the different geographical features of various land forms (mountains, islands, plains, and deserts). She had students cut out outdoor scenes from National Geographic. Linda collected the cut out scenes, categorized them into the four different land forms, and pasted them onto a large poster. She then gathered the students around the poster and had them discuss any differences they could find between the different groups of pictures (observation of Linda 10/12/89). Gathering curricular materials from different sources had become somewhat of an obsession for Linda:

> I'm a real pack rat. You should see all of the stuff I've got stored in my house. I have two large file cabinets full and one whole wall plastered with books. My husband is going to kill me. That's okay; I've got it, and even when my daughter brings stuff home from her school, I'll use it. I probably have enough stuff for all the elementary grades. I've saved National Geographic for years. I've collected and categorized them by country or by animal. All I need is a laminating machine here at home. (interview with Linda 12/1/89)

Karen, who had little curricular freedom in her inner-city field placement, attempted to "add one creative thing to every lesson" (interview with Karen 9/19/89). Once, in a lesson she was teaching on using descriptive adjectives in sentences, Karen had students write a detailed description of a witch, even though it was not an assignment in the teacher's manual. After the students finished these descriptions, they exchanged papers with their neighbors and attempted to draw each other's witch description (interview with Karen 11/30/89).

Carol's first opportunity to teach came when she was given charge of the top eight readers in the fifth grade class. Instead of using the basal reading series that her cooperating teacher was using, Carol decided to have students read a novel by Lloyd Alexander entitled The Book of Three (observation of Carol 9/25/89). Later, Carol was given charge of the rest of the class. It was the contention of many of the teachers Carol talked to at her school that using trade books was fine for above average readers but was not suitable for average and below average students. Carol, however, felt that using trade books was essential for all fifth graders, even more so with the average and below average students (interview with Carol 10/6/89). Therefore, Carol decided against using the commercially produced reading series and opted instead to use the novel The Wish Giver, by Bill Brittain, for the

average and below average fifth graders (observation of Carol 10/6/89).

Jane describes herself as "the kind of teacher who doesn't want to teach out of the book" (interview with Jane 10/6/89). Many of the activities she introduced came from sources other than the commercially produced textbooks. For example, Jane developed several learning centers. One center, which went with the science unit Jane was teaching, asked students to study a picture of an outdoor scene. Several things were happening in the picture, such as lawn sprinklers turning on and clouds floating by. Students were to make a list of each occurrence, categorizing them into solids, liquids, or gases. Another learning center had students making "cut-up" sentences using words and phrases that they could find in the newspaper Jane provided (observation of Jane 11/4/89).

Viewing the teacher as a learner was another important concept for the key informants. Carol was constantly looking for better ways to do things.

> In my methods courses, we would see a video of a whole language lesson being taught to six students. I wondered, "What do you do with the rest of the kids?" I would love to interact with other teachers who have tried some whole language and find out what they are doing, and then I could have some ideas to borrow from. (interview with Carol 9/26/89)

Carol had her students doing a writing activity. One student was having trouble getting started, so this researcher showed the student how to do a conceptual map in hopes that it would offer some guidance to the young writer.

Carol, observing the help given to her student, later asked about what was done. After an explanation of the technique and the rationale behind it, Carol responded favorably and mentioned that it was a "good idea" and that she would have to use it sometime (observation of Carol 11/3/89).

Like Carol, Linda was searching for better ways to instruct students. Linda explains that her visits to other teachers' classrooms at the end of her student teaching experience were "the most valuable days I spent. . . .I was looking for good ideas. I made notes. I wish I'd more days like that" (interview with Linda 12/1/89).

Jane not only saw herself as a learner, but also she demonstrated to her students that she was actively involved in learning:

> I was consciously trying to demonstrate reading and writing. If it is reading time, and I say reading is something really fun and important, and when we do it and I'm grading papers, then I think that sends a message to the kids that is a mixed signal. When we do writing, and we are brainstorming, I'll put a pencil in my hands and brainstorm with them, and I'll exchange papers with them, too. When it is clean up time, I also clean up. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

Observing the students to learn how to guide them better in their learning was one of the teacher's roles the key informants discussed as being important. Carol describes such activity:

> Watching what they are doing. If there is a reading group, and they are discussing a book, go over to the group and observe the kinds of conversations that are going on. If they are getting off task, get them back on task by asking them one question like, "What about this?" If they are over at the art table or something, maybe asking them a question to think about different colors they might use. (interview with Carol 4/26/89).

Carol was always alert to what students were telling her through their actions. Once while reading a story aloud to her class as they did their morning assignments, Carol noticed a student having difficulty with the morning's math assignment. Carol asked Jodi, one of her better math students, to lend assistance to her classmate. Carol explained afterwards that she liked the way Jodi was able to help her classmate with the math, while the rest of the class listened to Carol read without interruption (observation of Carol 10/16/89).

Carol's observation of students also led to decisions on curricular activities. Chris, one of the better readers in the fifth grade, was writing for his own enjoyment a "Mid-evil Recipe Book," a compilation of different magical potions. After seeing Chris's book and noticing the enjoyment he got out of writing it, Carol decided to initiate a book writing assignment. She called together six students who had just completed reading a novel. Carol showed the group Chris's recipe book and began a discussion on what kind of books they might write. She gave students some strategies to help them get started and then turned them loose to begin their stories (observation of Carol 11/3/89).

Karen spent a lot of time watching her students, trying to figure out if they were comprehending the intended material. For example, one of Karen's third grade students named Mark seem to be really struggling with his work.

Karen wondered if part of Mark's problem stemmed from poor reading strategies, so she had Mark read to her. "He wasn't doing very well. He was not even reading the words correctly, and I doubt if he comprehends anything" (interview with Karen 10/4/89).

Through her observation of students as well as parents, Karen began to focus on the cultural backgrounds of her students. Karen's school was located five blocks from the downtown of a large Midwestern city in a lower socioeconomic section of the city. The majority of the students were white, with over sixty percent of them on both free lunch and free breakfast (interview with Karen's cooperating teacher 9/1/89). Karen became upset with many of the students' attitudes toward school, which she concluded stemmed from their family backgrounds:

> A lot of these children's parents only care that they don't fail. Some of the parents care if their kids get D's, but mostly they only care if it is an F on their report card. This kind of community doesn't strive for the A's and the B's. The Appalachian culture is like this: you have this place in life; you're not really there to do better than everyone else; you're just there to get by from day to day. As long as you pass, that is okay; you're moving on. It isn't true for all the kids and all the parents, but a lot of them. (interview with Karen 12/14/89)

The key informants' observations were not confined solely to the students' academic pursuits. Linda observed during a week of lunchroom duty that one of her second grade girls was only eating half of her lunch, whereas the previous week she had eaten all of her food. It turned out that this girl had been diagnosed as hyperactive and was

taking medication for her condition, which seemed to have affected her appetite (interview of Linda 10/2/89).

These student teachers did not view the teacher as someone who bureaucratically controlled students' behavior and learning; instead, they viewed the teacher as a facilitator who set up the environment, allowing students to pursue their own personal knowledge. Jane, for example, discussed the intent of the many learning centers that were set up in her room:

> We [Jane and her cooperating teacher] don't explain the learning center. We set them up and leave the directions at the centers, and the kids are responsible. If they have questions, I'll go over and help them. But we stay out of their way. They keep a journal where they record everything that they are doing. We look over that at the end of the day, but we do not actively participate with the students while they are engaged at the centers. (interview with Jane 9/7/89)

Jane used the words "facilitator" and "guide" when describing her teaching role (interview with Jane 3/28/89 and 11/13/89). An example illustrating Jane's facilitator style occurred during a penpal activity she had initiated with a retirement center in town. Each of her third grade students was given the name of an "adopted grandparent" penpal to write to. Students were given the responsibility of writing letters on their own once they had received a name. Although Jane made sure that her students initially wrote their letters, she was not at all certain how many times the students and their adopted grandparents had exchanged letters thereafter (interview with Jane 12/11/89). However, many of the students must have written letters

because there was a special day set up in which students were to invite their adopted grandparents to the classroom to visit. Jane described the event:

> Oh gosh, there was weeping; the elderly folks were hugging the students. We had a great turn out. I think we had more adults than children. Some of the students elected to invite their adopted grandparents and their real grandparents. I don't know exactly how many adopted grandparents came, probably ten or fifteen. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

Carol also used the word "guide" to express her teaching role (interview with Carol 4/26/89). Her style of teaching was exemplified one day as she was leading a discussion with her reading group. Carol began the discussion by saying, "Discuss with each other up to the chapter 'The Black Lake'" (observation of Carol 9/18/89). Because of the lack of response by students, Carol instructed the students as follows: "Turn to page 150. We're going to do an activity called 'say something'" (observation of Carol 9/18/89). Carol explained the activity as one in which different members of the group would read a part of the story and then say something that the passage reminded them of. Carol demonstrated what she meant by going first. The passage Carol read was about some characters who were sitting around a table. Carol explained that for her, the passage conjured up images of all the animals in the zoo sitting around the table talking to each other. Unlike the earlier discussion that fizzled out, the say something activity generated some interesting student response: "It reminds me of not seeing my grandparents who

are living in Nigeria". . ."It reminds me of Monroe Lake in the middle of the night" (observation of Carol 9/18/89).

In the area of student/teacher relations, the key informants viewed the teacher's role as one fostering a personal and caring relationship with students. But this personal and caring relationship was balanced by their desire for students to give them a certain degree of respect. Carol, for example, went out of her way to learn about her fifth grade students and spent a lot of time helping students with such things as organizing their school materials and helping them get their work in on time. Once Carol had David and Thea, two students who were having trouble getting their work done, come in during their lunch recess to clean out their desks (observation of Carol 9/18/89). Not satisfied with their cleanup efforts, Carol decided to roll up her sleeves and pitch in. She explained her effort: "Their desks are so disorganized, it kills me" (interview with Carol 9/18/89).

On the other hand, Carol demanded that students carry out her orders. Sam, a student who once asked Carol for her home phone number and then called and talked to her (interview with Carol 10/6/89), refused once to do what Carol requested:

> He [Sam] was lying on the table, and I said you can sit on the table, but don't lie down on them. He just lay there, and I said, "Sit in your chair." He said "No," and I said, "You can come in after lunch, and we'll talk about this." (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

Carol had Sam write several sentences promising from then on to follow Carol's orders. Carol explained, "I had Sam write lines, but I only made him write a few, and then I asked him, 'Do you know why you are writing these?' He then realized that he shouldn't have said what he said to me" (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

Like Carol, Jane spent a great deal of time getting to know her third grade students. One way Jane did so was by exchanging personal letters with students. In Jane's classroom, everyone, including the teachers, had mailboxes. Jane would write letters to students and invite them to write her back (observation of Jane 9/12/89).

Another way Jane attempted to develop a personal relationship with students was by encouraging students to call her by her first name. Students picked up on her encouragement, and Jane became known to her students as Miss Jane (observation of Jane 9/7/89). However, Jane was confronted by discipline problems. According to Jane's cooperating teacher, "Jane had several weeks of real trying times where she had troubles with several children and had to work her way through that" (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89). Jane believed that her discipline problems were caused by not being firm enough: "I made the grave error of being too lenient. I didn't put my foot down at appropriate times. Now I am" (interview with Jane 11/4/89).

Concept of Students

The key informants viewed students as active agents in their own learning. Linda saw students as researchers and even encouraged students to call themselves researchers (observation of Linda 8/29/89). One activity Linda initiated was having students learn what they could about turtles. Linda had captured a turtle and brought it to school; also, she had brought in several books about turtles. Linda put up on the bulletin board a large piece of paper with two categories: 1) what we know about turtles and, 2) what we can find out. The class discussed what they had learned about turtles through their observations and their readings, while Linda wrote those things down in the first category. Then students and teacher made a list of things about turtles that they would like to know more about. For instance, one student wondered what turtles ate, which Linda added to category two in the form of a question. Following the discussion, Linda showed a video on turtles that she had secured from the city library. One of the statements made during the video was that turtles ate mosquitoes, which was immediately picked up by a student. The student excitedly pointed to the question in category two and exclaimed, "Turtles eat mosquitoes!" (observation of Linda 9/29/89).

Karen believed pupils should actively investigate things that interested them:

> I am very much in favor of the kids finding out things for themselves and learning how to do that because so

> many times in school they have this feeling that they need the answer to be right and not trusting themselves to know where to find the answer. (interview with Karen 11/21/89).

Karen brought in several supplementary books to go with various science units. In one unit on eggs, several students became interested in the books that Karen had brought in. One student, Donald, who perused several of the books, became interested in whether or not bats laid eggs like other flying creatures. Seizing the opportunity, Karen went over to an encyclopedia and helped Donald find out if there was some information in the book that could answer his question (observation of Karen 9/19/89).

Carol implemented several learning activities in which students were actively involved with the material. For example, one science lesson was an experiment in which students had to dissect a fish. Armed with a knife, magnifying lens, and specimen dish, students were to dissect the fish and identify the different parts. Once they identified the parts, they had to try to determine their function (observation of Carol 9/26/89). In another science experiment, students were instructed to go outside, dig up a section of top soil, and bring it into the room for an analysis. Again students were equipped with a magnifying lens and instructed to identify any living organisms (observation of Carol 10/25/89).

The key informants believed that students should make choices in what they learned. Jane, for example, provided students with opportunities to do things they were

interested in. Jane had the class brainstorm some ideas, and it was decided by the class that they would do the Thanksgiving play (interview with Jane 11/8/89).

Linda offered students choices because she believed that ". . .unless students have the opportunity to make choices, they won't be able to make proper ones" (interview with Linda 10/2/89). One time a group of students, who had just written a creative story, were asked by Linda to share their story with other members of the group. However, one student was hesitant to share his story. Linda, understanding his hesitancy, explained to him, "That is okay not to share [his story]; sometimes author's don't like to share their stories" (observation of Linda 10/2/89).

Linda also introduced activities that her second grade students could participate in or not. One activity was a project she did on crickets. Linda had captured a cricket, placed it in a jar, and put it in the back of the room. Anyone interested in becoming a "cricket expert" could begin keeping a notebook on crickets. Interested students consulted books, studied the specimen in the jar, and asked others about crickets. Any information they learned, they put in their notebooks (interview with Linda 9/30/89).

Carol provided students with choice because, in her view, a student's choice "is something they want to do and will take responsibility for" (interview with Carol 11/8/89). One way Carol provided choice was by giving students options in doing their assignments. After reading

a trade book, for example, students had the choice of seven different options for a final project, such as writing and enacting a television interview, writing a newspaper story, or making a diorama (observation of Carol 9/26/89).

Another way Carol provided choice was by supplementing textbooks that she used with outside materials. In a geometry unit she taught, for instance, her cooperating teacher wanted the concepts of line, angle, and polygon covered. Carol used the fifth grade adopted math textbook the school provided along with two other math textbooks in order to offer students a variety of learning experiences (interview with Carol 9/14/89). Moreover, Carol set up a learning center in which students were to construct objects from different geometric shapes. The idea for the center came from a pamphlet entitled, "Fun with Tanograms," which gave an artistic perspective to geometric shapes (observation of Carol 9/26/89).

Lastly, the key informants viewed students as being responsible for their learning and behavior. It annoyed Karen when students would complete their homework without putting much thought into their assignments. In one assignment on drawing conclusions, two students had totally illogical answers to every question. Karen held a conference with the two students and went through the assignment with them. After they had gone over the assignment, Karen instructed them to go back to their seats and change their answers (observation of Karen 10/11/89).

Karen explained her reasons for such attention to the homework: "I wanted to make them accountable for not thinking and just writing an answer down" (interview with Karen 11/30/89).

Carol had several students in her fifth grade class who were having trouble getting their assignments turned in. After meeting with parents, Carol decided that these students needed a technique to help themselves become more responsible. Therefore, she instructed students who were having difficulty turning assignments in to carry around a notebook only for writing down all of their homework assignments. Then teachers would sign their assignment books before students were dismissed, and parents would sign the assignment books acknowledging their homework for that day (interview with Carol 9/21/89).

Another technique Carol used for helping students become responsible for their learning was the use of contracts. Students who were reading trade books were allowed to negotiate with Carol on how many pages they would read and when those pages would be completed. Once an agreement was reached, both student and teacher would sign the document (observation of Carol 10/6/89).

Jane worked towards helping students become responsible for solving their social conflicts. It was a common occurrence for members of her third grade class to hit each other when there was a disagreement. Jane held a classroom meeting, explaining to students her position on hitting

their fellow classmates: "People are hitting each other, and that I will not tolerate in this classroom" (observation of Jane 11/4/89). Jane then asked the class for strategies that students could use in dealing with someone who was hitting or making fun of them. Several suggestions were offered, such as staying away from persons who resorted to hitting people. Jane completed her lecture to students: "There has [sic] been some suggestions given on things you can do besides hitting. I want you to solve your own problems. You don't necessarily need me to solve your problems" (observation of Jane 11/4/89).

Summary

The key informants' whole language philosophy was not only a means for thinking about how to teach language arts but also a philosophy that gave meaning to the way they viewed existing school practices, the curriculum, knowledge, the role of the teacher, and the role of students.

This chapter has provided a description of how student teachers with a whole language perspective manifested their perspective in the daily activities of student teaching. The next chapter will look at constraining forces which significantly limited these student teachers' opportunities to put their theories into practice.

RESPONSES

"Thank you for sending the third chapter. It was interesting and fun to go back and remember all the things that I said and did during student teaching. I also got some great ideas from reading about the other student teachers that you wrote about and some of the things that they tried.

My teaching job now (hired as a fifth grade teacher in a suburban school of a large metropolitan area in December of 1989) is also very exciting, and I am incorporating even more "whole language" type ideas into the curriculum and classroom set up. I still haven't opened the basal! I am also going to observe a fifth grade whole language classroom on May 11, 1990. My principal is very interested in whole language, she got her masters from _____ University and had one of the college professors who taught me whole language.

Well, I enjoyed reading your transcript, and I think that future teachers would benefit reading it before they begin their student teaching. Maybe it will become a required book in an education course, and you will make tons of money!" (personal correspondence with Carol 4/30/90)

"I liked the chapter! I think it is well put together. My approach to education is wholistic and I try to integrate all subject areas together when possible. I also, as you mentioned, try to give the students as much choice as possible.

On Page 61 in talking about Russell I wanted to point out that I place a great deal of importance in a person's ownership of their writing, so I suggested to Russell that maybe his book wasn't his best work but left the final decision up to him.

On page 70 learning to be involved with "running" the centers was very difficult for me to learn to do. Listening from afar is the key to this." (personal correspondence with Jane 5/14/90)

"I had two initial reactions to the chapter: 1) jealousy, because I wish I had enjoyed my teacher, school, and class as much as the other student teachers, and 2) appreciation that someone noticed and maybe even approved of my makeshift attempts to bring some aspects of whole language into the classroom.

I think you gave a good description of mine and the other student teachers' experiences. They were clear, and I think showed our belief in whole language approaches. I'm interested in the next chapter on "constraining forces." I would also benefit from an outline of all that will be included in the paper for my own personal reference.

As far as my reactions, I think you touched on many of my teaching beliefs that I will continue when I get a job: process learning, active learning, student accountability, language arts across an integrated curriculum, etc. You

pointed out many of the things I was proud of during my experience. There are many more things that I didn't appreciate feeling pressured into doing. One time she (Karen's cooperating teacher) asked me to go over the vocabulary words in one of the stories we were reading. Not only was she in the room but another teacher as well. I just felt like stopping and telling everyone I didn't believe in what I was doing and why I didn't believe in it. She felt my weaknesses were in teaching reading and math skills. I wish I could have explain that reading and math aren't just skills." (personal correspondence with Karen 4/17/90)

"I devoured the material. Not to see where I fit or how I was doing compared to others but eager to find new ideas and the means to a happy end.

I found myself evaluating the experiences of the other student teachers and trying to determine when I could use that technique or idea in my classroom. (personal correspondence with Linda" 4/23/90)

CHAPTER FOUR

CONSTRAINING FACTORS ON WHOLE LANGUAGE PERSPECTIVES

Student teaching does not take place in a vacuum. Instead, it takes place in environments rich in complexity and fraught with constraints. Each of the key informants (Karen, Carol, Linda, and Jane), as well as the ancillary informants (Paula and Rita), were subject to many constraining factors that interfered with their teaching perspectives. Doyle (1977) explains how the ecological factors (e.g., teacher-pupil ratio, student ability, resources and supplies) found in classrooms exert influence on how student teachers teach:

> . . .environmental demands moderate performance and establish limits on the range of response options. From this perspective, learning to teach involves learning the "texture of the classroom" and a set of behaviors congruent with the demands of that setting. (p. 51)

The purpose of Chapter Four is to describe how both the key informants and the ancillary informants were forced to significantly alter their teaching behaviors because of constraining factors found in their placement sites. In order to illustrate the individual struggles that each of the key informants' had with her specific contexts, a vignette--illustrating an area of constraint--will be drawn. The different categories of constraining factors that cut across all of the informants experiences will then be outlined. Additionally, Pollard's (1982) three layers of social contextualization (interactive, institutional, and

cultural) will be used to help delineate the levels of constraint that inhibited the informants. In addition to Pollard's three layers of social contextualization, a fourth area--personal constraining factors--will be added.

Blocks to Initial Whole Language Perspectives: Four Vignettes

During the course of their student teaching experiences, all of the informants were forced to some degree to significantly alter their whole language perspectives. Becher and Ade (1982) rightly point out that, "By their very nature no two placement sites are alike" (p. 25). As the following vignettes illustrate, these student teachers faced a wide diversity of constraints as they tried to act upon their initial whole language perspectives.

Linda's Context

Linda's placement site was a second grade in a rural area. The class was unusually large with thirty-one students. At the beginning of the year, Linda's cooperating teacher established a system where students were handed between seven and twelve work sheets each day to complete. As students completed their work sheets, Linda's cooperating teacher called groups of students who had been placed into four groups from "high" to "low" to come up to the front of the room and receive reading instruction. She used a commercially produced reading series that had been adopted by the school corporation (interview with Linda's building principal 1/17/90). The reading series came complete with

a basil reading book and workbook for each student, a teacher's manual, and a duplicating book of extra work sheets. Each reading group would spend approximately thirty minutes with the teacher as they read their story aloud. After the students had finished the story, they would be assigned some of the six to eight workbook pages that went along with each story.

Before Linda was given the responsibility for taking over teaching duties, she discussed what she thought her cooperating teacher's expectations for her were:

> I think her intention is to get the room running and then have me do whatever it takes to make it work. For me to see how she wants things to run and then to run it like she wants it run. I think she is going to dump it all on me, and I don't have any problem with that. (8/22/89)

But when Linda took on the teaching responsibilities and tried to work within the framework of her cooperating teacher's system, she found that there was not enough time to implement some of the assignments she favored doing. For example, after one of the reading groups had finished its work in the basal reader, Linda wanted the students to write their own adventure stories. Not much time remained, however, before students had to go back to their seats, giving way to the next reading group. Moreover, students did not expect long-term assignments, nor did they have the disposition for doing an assignment over an extended period of time--assignments were given, students got busy on them, and then turned them in. The result was that students spent only seven minutes on their adventure stories. The stories,

needless to say, were short, most of them two or three sentences long (observation of Linda 10/20/89).

Linda admitted that trying to run the classroom as her cooperating teacher did was a "real problem" (interview with Linda 10/23/89). It was Linda's contention that many of the work sheets that her cooperating teacher required were not necessary, "If it were me and my classroom, we would chuck all the busy work" (interview with Linda 10/23/89). But Linda felt obligated to follow the same routines that her cooperating teacher had established, "Because when you do your student teaching, the cooperating teacher expects for you to give it back to them in that sort of routine" (interview with Linda 12/1/89).

Karen's Context

Karen's placement site was a third grade in an inner city school. Her school corporation, the largest in the state, was made up of sixty-seven elementary schools which had a combined total of more than thirty thousand students. The majority of Karen's eighteen students come from the white neighborhood that surrounded her building, and most walked to school. The neighborhood was located approximately ten blocks from downtown. Twelve of the eighteen students were on both free lunch and free breakfast (interview with Karen's cooperating teacher 9/1/89).

Karen's classroom was very teacher-directed, reflecting the custodial style of her cooperating teacher. The following classroom rules were posted at the front of the

room and were continually emphasized by her cooperating teacher: 1) follow directions, 2) come to class prepared to learn, 3) stay in seats unless otherwise directed, 4) don't bother others, and 5) obey all school rules (observation of Karen 9/1/89). Karen's cooperating teacher explains her style of classroom management: "I usually like to set standards for the classroom and set class rules and start working on study habits that first week" (interview with Karen's cooperating teacher 8/22/89).

Karen's cooperating teacher yelled at students who had failed to obey her classroom rules. For example, several students were yelled at for forgetting to take their homework books out of their book bags that were hung in the classroom closet beside their jackets--students failed to follow rule #2 (observation of Karen 9/1/89). Karen recalls one incident in which a student, Mark, came up to talk to her and was spanked by her cooperating teacher for being out of his seat, a violation of rule #3 (interview with Karen (11/30/89).

When Karen began taking over the teaching responsibilities, she found her efforts to encourage pupil initiative rejected or abused by students who had been socialized to expect teacher demands and close control. For instance, in a lesson on map skills, Karen decided to have her students go on a tour of the school grounds with the intent of each student making a map of his/her school. Once outside, however, students began picking up acorns and

throwing them at each other; inside, Karen found that students were unable to independently design their own maps as she had anticipated (interview with Karen 10/4/89). Karen voiced her dissatisfaction with the students' actions:

> You have to go step by step; they need the structure. They can't seem to do it on their own. We [Karen and her cooperating teacher] started it off by letting the kids do it on their own, but now we are doing it step by step as a class. It is an activity in following directions. (interview with Karen 10/4/89)

Controlling the students' behavior became the main focus for Karen as she went about her teaching responsibilities. She explains:

> All my time and energy seem to be focused on the discipline issue. I said to the class, "How can I be anything but mean? I try to be helpful to you, but you will not listen." I got so frustrated at them I said, "If you don't want to listen, fine, do it yourself!" I was ready to walk out that building and not come back. I totally feel like a failure as far as classroom discipline is concerned. (interview with Karen 10/11/89).

Because of her concern with controlling students and what her cooperating teacher might think if students were out of control, many of the ideas Karen had about teaching were put on the shelf and never used. One area of constraint was with group discussions. Karen explained:

> Kids bring up interesting things; I'd rather let them explore what interests them. Like today talking about science, the kids started telling stories. I would like to do that, but I didn't want to let it go too far because I didn't want my cooperating teacher thinking I was letting the kids run the class. (interview with Karen 9/25/89)

Furthermore, Karen mentioned that she would like to have students work together in groups but was restricted by both the students inability to get along with one another and the

difficulty of keeping the classroom noise at a level acceptable to her cooperating teacher (interview with Karen 11/21/89).

Carol's Context

Carol's placement site was a fifth grade in a small Midwestern city of approximately 50,000 people. In her school there were two fifth grade classes. Two teachers taught fifth grade as a team; consequently, Carol had two cooperating teachers. One cooperating teacher, Dick, specialized in science and math and taught those subjects to both classes. The other, Connie, specialized in and taught English and social studies. Both taught spelling and reading. Carol spent her mornings with Dick teaching math, spelling, and reading; then went across the hall and taught English and social studies to the same group of students in Connie's room.

Dick and Connie used a teacher-directed style of teaching. The lecture format dominated instruction. In order to establish continuity for students in the subjects of science and social studies, Carol's two cooperating teachers used an outline format: teachers would write notes in standard outline form on the chalkboard, students would copy them, and refer to them later when studying for tests (observation of Carol 9/18/89).

Since her cooperating teachers taught as a team--teaching the morning class their two specialty subjects and then switching classes and teaching the same two subjects to

the afternoon class--Carol was, for the most part, forced into teaching the subjects of science, social studies, math, and English very similarly to the way her cooperating teachers taught. She had to give a lecture and write up the outline on the chalkboard when she taught science and social studies--a means of teaching she described as "somewhat boring" (observation of Carol 9/15/89). Carol explained the situation as she saw it:

> If I teach science in the morning, Dick is going to have to teach the science to the other kids in the afternoon, so we are going to have to be doing basically the same thing. The same is true with social studies. If I do one thing, Connie can't do another. (interview with Carol 9/5/89).

One such instance where Carol was forced into doing what her cooperating teacher did occurred in English. Carol was set to begin a poetry unit in English for her afternoon class. Carol's cooperating teacher, however, had not started the poetry unit with her morning class because of time limitations. Since Carol's cooperating teacher wanted to keep the students together, it was decided prior to the beginning of Carol's afternoon class that she would also hold off beginning the poetry unit and would fill in the time reading a story to the students (observation of Carol 9/15/89).

Jane's Context

Jane's placement site was a third grade located in the same school as Carol's fifth grade placement. Unlike Carol's placement site, though, Jane's third graders had only one teacher who taught them all the subjects except

art, music, and gym. Moreover, Jane's cooperating teacher, who described herself as a "non-traditional person," employed a student-centered teaching philosophy in her classroom (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 9/7/89). Each student had an individual folder that contained a personalized work schedule to follow. Their work schedules were based in part on their individual skills, their needs, and their interests. Jane's cooperating teacher explained that, "the way you learn about students is by watching them and interacting with them, not by grading papers" (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 10/25/89). There were twelve learning centers throughout the room in which students interacted. Using their individual work schedules as a guide, student were responsible for completing the assignments at a certain number of the learning centers each week.(observation of Jane 11/8/89).

Jane's cooperating teacher described her philosophy on teaching language arts:

> Language arts is taught as a whole process. I don't look at a child as one thing or another. I see them as being really great talkers, or leaders, or someone who is very cooperative, or someone who loves to read. I see all of these different skills at different levels, so I try to focus right away on those high points--to try and get the kids to feel really good about being in this room. Hey, I'm a part of this and I'm great. Then I focus in on the lower points, trying to get them up to third grade level.

According to Jane, the whole language philosophy she believes in and her cooperating teacher's philosophy were very similar. Jane further explained that she had the

freedom to design the learning centers, pick projects she was interested in doing, and teach subjects such as science the way she wanted to (interview with Jane 12/18/89). Despite these freedoms, there were instances in which Jane was inhibited from manifesting her teaching perspective.

For example, even though Jane described herself as "not the kind that wants to teach out of the book" (interview with Jane 10/6/89), when given the opportunity to teach science, she depended heavily on her textbook. In fact, her cooperating teacher complained that she carried the teacher's manual for science "like it was a real precious thing" and believed that Jane should get away from "clutching" it (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 10/25/89).

Two of the biggest reasons for Jane's reliance on the textbook were her inexperience with whole group instruction and, as a result of this lack of expertise, the heavy criticism she received from her university supervisor during one of her initial attempts at teaching the whole class. Jane lamented her lack of experience: "I have a lot of book knowledge and some small group experience but not much experience with large groups" (interview with Jane 10/6/89). Lacking confidence in teaching a large group to begin with, Jane was "crushed" when her university supervisor criticized a lesson she taught on graphing populations. Believing at the time that her teaching career's foundation was

crumbling, Jane commented: "Maybe I'll get my degree and take a job at Burger King" (interview with Jane 10/6/89).

Jane's lack of experience coupled with the criticisms she received from her university supervisor resulted in Jane adopting a conservative style for planning and teaching her first science unit, a style that carried over to the next science unit she taught:

> Researcher: How did the kids do on the second science unit?
> Jane: The kids did fantastic. There was no grade below B- on their tests.
> Researcher: Why were they so successful?
> Jane: The first test we did a lot of hands-on activities, and this time we did straight lecture. We whipped through the chapter in a week. (interview with Jane 11/23/89)

Clearly, the contexts of the informants placement sites held wide differences. Despite these differences, however, there were similar constraining factors that cut across them. Moreover, many of the responses that informants had to these constraining factors were alike. The next section will examine different categories of constraining factors that had a conserving impact on the whole language perspectives of the informants. As mentioned earlier, in order to get a more comprehensive view of the different levels of constraining factors, Pollard's three levels of contextualization (interactive, institutional, and cultural) along with a fourth factor, personal constraining factors, will be used.

Four Levels Of Constraints

Pollard (1982) has proposed a conceptual model which describes three levels of social contextualization: interactive, institutional, and cultural. The interactive level describes the classroom context and those forces that originate at that level (e.g., teacher-pupil relations, relationships with cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and students). The institutional level stands for the properties of the school culture that exert constraints (textbooks, resources available), and the cultural level describes those forces that originate outside the school that exert constraints (e.g., state mandated tests). The fourth level added to Pollard's levels, personal constraining factors, consists of those biographical factors which orient individuals to respond in certain ways (e.g., personality traits, pedagogical skill, and motivation). By applying four different levels of analysis to this case study, a more complete picture of the constraining factors that impact student teachers can be drawn.

It must be noted, however, that the main focus of data collection for this research study was at the classroom level and personal level; therefore, the institutional and cultural levels of analysis are only partial. Clearly, more research needs to be undertaken which focuses more on these two levels of analysis.

Interactive Level

The interactive level, which takes place in the classroom, was where the student teachers faced the day-to-day situations that constituted their experience. It was at this level that all the levels--institutional, cultural, and personal--exerted their influence. However, in an attempt to illustrate how different constraints originated at different levels, only those constraints that originated in the interactive level will be described in this section.

A good way to understand how all the levels exerted their influence on the interactive level is to compare a classroom where students are taught to a greenhouse where tomatoes are grown. The actual growing of the tomatoes happens inside the greenhouse where the plants are rooted. A care giver is responsible for a certain number of plants to which s/he must water, fertilize, and regulate temperature. The personal characteristics of the care giver (e.g., how s/he handles the plants when tying them up, if s/he gives them the recommended amounts of water and fertilizer) affect the quality of the tomatoes. But decisions outside the care giver's jurisdiction influence how s/he cares for the tomato plants. The owner of the greenhouse makes decisions on varieties grown, amount of seedlings planted, quantity and quality of resources provided (e.g., type of soil, amount of water, type of fertilizers and chemical sprays used). Even beyond the owner's jurisdiction, events happen that affect the

tomatoes. For example, the kinds of chemical sprays on the market and their costs; the plentifulness of different natural resources needed, such as water; what the consumer wants when shopping for tomatoes; and the price they are willing to pay. As can be seen, decisions about the way tomatoes are grown are made at several different levels.

As these student teachers carried out their day-to-day responsibilities of student teaching, they faced a multitude of constraining factors that inhibited the way they went about manifesting their whole language perspectives. Certain constraining factors were more inhibiting than others. Furthermore, the degree of intensity of any one constraining factor differed, depending on the context and the student teacher's individual response to the constraint. The multitude of constraining factors that had an impact on the interactive level can be divided into the following three categories: 1) influence of those with formal sanctioning power, 2) influence from students, and 3) limitations of time.

Significant Others Constraints: The individual who exerted the most influence on the way the informants carried out their teaching duties was the cooperating teacher. Except for Jane's and Rita's cooperating teachers who had similar whole language perspectives and in most instances helped enable the informants (see chapter five), the individual who exerted the most constraints on the informants was the cooperating teacher. The cooperating

teacher's beliefs on what his/her role as a cooperating teacher was and his/her beliefs on how curriculum and instruction should be enacted significantly influenced the type of world these student teachers found in their placement sites.

Karen's cooperating teacher, who taught third grade in an inner city school, carried out her supervisory role by controlling the decisions on what was to be taught, and to a large extent, how it was to be taught.

After observing her cooperating teacher teach the first week, Karen slowly began taking over some teaching responsibilities. Karen was handed a curriculum to follow that was determined mostly by the textbooks that had been adopted by the school corporation. A typical lesson as taught by Karen's cooperating teacher consisted of the teacher directing students through their textbooks and/or the commercially produced materials that accompanied the textbooks (e.g., student workbooks, supplemental work sheets). Often times when teaching reading, Karen's cooperating teacher would read straight from the teacher's manual, asking questions and waiting for the correct pupil responses (correspondence with Karen 6/12/90).

Most of the lessons Karen taught resembled those of her cooperating teacher. For example, one of Karen's first lessons was in spelling. Prior to the lesson, Karen's cooperating teacher had explained to her exactly how she would teach the lesson taught. The lesson began when

Karen's cooperating teacher told students to quietly put away their books, to get out their spelling books, and to give their attention to Karen. Karen proceeded to go over the lesson as it was presented in the book. Students took turns reading the questions and then answering some of the questions. After each of the questions from the spelling book were read and Karen had made sure everyone understood what they were to do, students were instructed to correctly put the heading (name, date, and subject) on his/her paper and begin the assignment. Karen then went around and helped students individually who had trouble completing the assignment (observation of Karen 9/11/89).

Karen's cooperating teacher explained that the reason Karen had spent so much time taking students through this spelling lesson was to teach them how to correctly do their spelling, since all spelling lessons were similar to this one (interview with Karen's cooperating teacher 9/11/89).

Karen expressed dissatisfaction with the way spelling was taught:

> Some of the things [activities in spelling] are so stupid, but I'll do them because my cooperating teacher wants me to, and it is her classroom. I'm only here ten weeks, and I'll be gone. I can't wait to get my own classroom. (interview with Karen 9/11/89)

Pressure from the cooperating teacher to maintain the existing forms of curriculum and instruction, such as Karen perceived, was felt by all of the informants. However, the pressure to maintain the status quo varied from subtle forms of control to more direct forms of control.

Karen discussed the pressure to maintain existing forms of curriculum and instruction:

> Researcher: What kind of pressure did your cooperating teacher put on you to keep her skills-oriented curriculum in place?
> Karen: She told me, "Okay this is how I teach spelling. On Mondays we do this, on Tuesday we do this." She would mark skills in the reading book that she didn't cover. She never said, "You have to do it this particular way," but she said, "This is the way it is done here." (interview with Karen 10/21/89)

Although most of the cooperating teachers, like Karen's, applied subtle forms of control to maintain their curriculum and instruction, there were incidents where the cooperating teacher applied more direct forms of control.

Paula, who was teaching science in a sixth grade class, was told by her cooperating teacher to drop her idea of teaching students how to apply the concepts of longitude and latitude. Paula had originally designed her mapping unit to emphasize these concepts, but when Paula showed her cooperating teacher the test she designed which contained many problems pertaining to longitude and latitude, Paula's cooperating teacher told her the students would not be able to do them and that she had to skip that part. Calling her cooperating teacher's request "disgusting," Paula reluctantly complied and redesigned her test similar to the ones her cooperating teacher designed: filling in the blanks. This resulted in Paula significantly altering the kind of instruction that she had originally planned in order to prepare students to do well on the new test (observation of Paula 11/17/89).

Two reasons surfaced as to why the informants made efforts to maintain existing teaching practices despite their disagreement with these practices. The first one, alluded to earlier in this chapter (See discussion of Linda's placement site pp 91-92), was the student teacher's assumption that when she took over teaching responsibilities her job was to substitute for the cooperating teacher. Substitutes do not alter the course of events; rather, they fill in and do what those in power do or tell them to do. Karen commented on how she saw her student teaching role:

> I always felt it was her classroom. I was only there for a short time compared to an entire school year. I didn't have the right to disturb that or to make her [cooperating teacher] upset. As her student teacher, I was just teaching her class. (interview with Karen 12/14/89)

A similar belief was expressed by Rita, whose placement site was a sixth grade in the same school as the placement sites of Paula, Carol, and Jane. When asked why she taught spelling as she did, even though she considered much of it "stupid," she said, "Why does a student teacher do anything?" Replying to her her own question, Rita answered, "Because her cooperating teacher does it" (interview with Rita 12/13/89).

The second reason for maintaining the teaching practices of the cooperating teacher was the importance attached to getting a good evaluation. Each of the informants was evaluated by her cooperating teacher at the end of her student teaching experience. All student teachers at the university were warned before doing their

student teaching on the importance of pleasing their cooperating teacher:

> This is a critical time for you. You must get a good evaluation if you want to get a job. There are two ways to be successful: 1) be motivated and 2) be flexible. Remember, you're going to have to adapt to them [cooperating teachers]. If they hand out work sheets, you're going to have to hand them out, too. You have to adjust to them. When you get your own classroom, then you can do what you want. (observation of acting director of student teaching addressing student teachers during the student teaching orientation meeting 8/22/89)

Not surprisingly, this warning was taken seriously by the informants. Carol voiced concern about her evaluation: "I think about it [final evaluation] all the time. It is a big deal" (interview with Carol 9/26/89). Voicing similar sentiments, Karen said: "Your biggest goal is to get a good evaluation. Your future employers are going to look at that" (interview with Karen 9/19/89).

While the cooperating teacher obviously exerted the most constraints on the informants, in some cases, the university supervisor also exerted pressure to conform.

One way the university supervisor constrained two of the informants (Karen and Linda) was by demanding certain requirements of them over and above those requirements demanded by their cooperating teacher. Linda, for example, was required to document how her lessons fit in with the state guidelines:

> More than once did my university supervisor make me do busy work. The last week that she came, she gets there, and she wants all this stuff. What she asked for me to do was to write out objectives and goals to make sure I was covering the bases with all these little dippy projects. So I make out lesson plans for

> every subject for the whole four weeks. That took me two weekends. When I brought them to my university supervisor she said, "Oh, this isn't what I wanted." I said, "You tell me what you want, and I'll give it to you." It turned out that what she wanted was to know how all those dippy things fit into the state curriculum and to make sure that I could support everything that I did if a parent called me on it. I went down to campus, pulled out the state guidelines, xeroxed the stuff for second grade, and cut and pasted the guidelines to every little handout we did. That was really stupid. (interview with Linda 12/1/89)

A second way the university supervisor constrained some informants was by what s/he failed to do. According to the director of student teaching, one of the main jobs of the university supervisor is to help the cooperating teacher and the student teacher work together (observation of university supervisor meeting 9/22/89). Very seldom, however, did any of the informants indicate that their university supervisor helped them work out disagreements or helped open lines of communication with their cooperating teachers. Karen voiced severe complaints towards her university supervisor's passive role:

> Here it is; I've been teaching for fourteen weeks, and I haven't sat down and talked with her [university supervisor] yet about my teaching. Maybe she'll come tomorrow, but what good will that do? (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

Furthermore, Karen felt cheated by the quality of university supervision she received and believed that her university supervisor could have helped a great deal:

> If I had last year's supervisor [supervisor Karen had her junior year], she would have come in at the beginning [of student teaching]. She would have talked to my teacher and talked to me about doing more of what I wanted to do. However, I didn't have that support. I felt cheated out of it. (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

Student Constraints: Lortie (1975) points out that the psychic rewards of teaching come largely from pupils. Each of the informants were influenced to a considerable degree by how the students responded to their learning activities. The whole language perspectives of these student teachers were notably constrained when pupils misbehaved, exhibited deficiencies in academic and/or social skills, or seemed unmotivated while engaged in learning activities that were whole language in nature.

Rita had a lot of discipline problems with her class of twenty-nine sixth graders. She indicated that there were six students who received special help from the school's social worker because of their antisocial behavior (interview with Rita 1/16/90). During a lesson on writing topic sentences where students were working together in groups, several students went out of control, upsetting the lesson and their student teacher:

> Researcher: Do students prevent you from trying some of these ideas?
> Rita: Yes, I'd say that definitely. During the lesson on topic sentences today, I got so frustrated with them to the point I had to yell at them to tell them to shut up, and I hate to do that. I had to do that this time because it was getting out of control. . . .That is how they inhibit me, by depressing me. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

Jane also found that the behavior of her students inhibited whole language teaching practices. She wanted her third graders to help their fellow classmates edit each other's stories. The editing phase was one of the stages in the authoring cycle, a process approach to writing that Jane

learned in her reading methods courses (interview with Jane 12/18/89). When students were ready for the editing phase of the writing project, Jane chose not to have students peer edit but, instead, had them self edit:

> This is the first time I've experienced having kids make fun of each other. I'm not going to let them do peer editing because they would rip each other to shreds. I'll have them do self editing instead. (interview with Jane 11/8/89)

Linda was often times frustrated when working with a lower level reading group during her second grade placement. Although she voiced strong beliefs in the importance of having students write, she found this lower level group both unable and unwilling to write (interview with Linda 10/23/89). Moreover, Linda indicated that many of her second graders lacked the necessary skills to help each other edit a story. Linda was quick to note, however, that this lack of skill was due to the limited opportunities students had to work in groups:

> Researcher: Would you say that the kids themselves inhibited you from cooperative learning?
> Linda: It just isn't offered [opportunities for cooperative learning]. It would have been really neat to have students work together when they made their presentations to the entire school. Although we chose not to do it, the kids could have done it. It would have taken time out from something else, but so what. (interview with Linda 12/1/89)

In Karen's view, her inner-city third graders disliked many of her whole language teaching practices:

> I'd like to say that I at least exposed them to reading for fun, reading for research, and those kinds of things. But from what the kids told me, it wasn't that fun for them to do that. A lot of them wanted to do it the easier way: filling out dittos, getting their work

> done, and not having to think very much. (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

Furthermore, Karen felt limited to the kind of homework she assigned. Because of a district-wide policy, all teachers were required to assign homework four times a week. Karen usually would assign them spelling homework out of their textbooks because she thought, "There was something they could do on there own" (interview with Karen 11/30/89). When she did assign "creative work," they would not do it:

> Once I asked them to draw maps of their bedrooms at home. I got maybe five out of eighteen. Things like that [drawing the maps], they were more unlikely to do. Something that might take effort on their part isn't what they want. (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

Time Constraints: Without question time limitations put a severe constraint on the informants' abilities to manifest their whole language perspectives. The informants found their own time--time that they could have used to plan and develop curriculum--in short supply as well as the amount of time given to them to put their methods of instruction into practice.

Because of financial need, Carol, Karen, and Jane were forced to work part-time jobs. Carol, who worked twenty-nine hours per week, reflected on her limited amount of time: "I would like to try some more learning centers. If I didn't work, I could do more with them" (interview with Carol 10/6/89). Carol particularly felt that she needed learning centers (places where students could go and independently learn subject matter) when teaching her fifth graders reading. Carol's system of reading, much different

than the reading book/workbook style of her cooperating teacher, had students reading trade books, discussing them with their teacher, and then doing independent and/or group projects on these trade books. During the course of a period, some students would be reading their books, others would be discussing their books, and still others would be engaged on a project of some kind. Carol found it difficult to manage the rest of the class when she was engaged in a discussion of the story with a small group. Carol voiced concern at putting into practice her whole language perspective when teaching reading:

> We would see a video of a whole language lesson being taught to six students. I would think, "What do you do with the rest of the kids?" Learning centers are what you do. (interview with Carol 9/26/89)

Karen found herself overwhelmed with the amount of work she had to do outside the classroom. Besides working part time, Karen had a lot of work to do outside the classroom because of a special program she had enrolled in at the university called the Urban Project. The Urban Project included the following requirements in addition to full-time student teaching: a five week stint in a social services agency prior to student teaching, a visit to two school board meetings and two urban issue meetings, eight interviews with citizens from the community where she did her student teaching, an adult literacy class to teach two evenings a week, and several written reports.

It was not uncommon for Karen to wake up at 5:00 a.m. to begin her day and not get back to her apartment until

after 9:00 pm. During the course of her student teaching, Karen admitted that all the work she was doing was making her "physically tired" (interview with Karen 10/4/89). After her student teaching experience was completed, Karen reflected on the Urban Project:

> I wish I could go down there [to the university] and tell those interested in the Urban Project not to do it. It isn't worth the time and energy. All the things you have to do take away from your teaching. The adult education was a great experience. I met the most interesting people, saw problems I never even knew existed for those immigrants who didn't know the language and don't know what it is like to live in this country. I'm glad I got exposed to it, but spending six hours a week doing that takes away from time I could have planned. (interview 11/30/89)

Besides the limited amount of time they had for planning and developing materials, the informants found a limited amount of time for accomplishing all that they wanted to do when teaching. Paula, who had developed a unit on communities with her second graders, found that there was less time than she needed:

> The way it works in our classroom now, time is just a killer. Teachers have either science or social studies; they don't have science every day or social studies every day. That is why I'm combining my social studies and science unit every day, so I can do both every day. Time is horrible, always. There are so many interruptions, special classes, and this and that. (interview with Paula 8/30/89)

Rita also found classroom time constraints as one of the major limiting factors for her. Even though Rita volunteered to extend her student teaching to include an extra week, she did not feel that she had accomplished all that she wanted to with her sixth graders:

> Researcher: I gathered that although you were able to do a lot, there were limitations.
> Rita: One thing that I didn't realize was the time that you're in there is so short, and it goes by so fast, that even if I had those kids a whole year I wouldn't be able to do everything I would want to do; it just goes by like a blink of the eye. When you have this list of things you want to get done, it [student teaching experience] isn't very long at all. (interview with Rita 1/16/90)

Compounding the problem of time constraints was the fact that many of the whole language activities that these student teachers attempted required pupils to be engaged in the activity for extended periods of time.

Jane found that her attempts at using the authoring cycle short circuited by time restrictions. Jane admitted that even though her cooperating teacher gave students many opportunities to write, there was no particular block of time set aside each day when students could write their own creative material; thus, she found herself unable to put the authoring cycle into full operation:

> I maintained my cooperating teacher's system. It isn't so much that the authoring cycle is so radically different than what she does because it is not. But it [authoring cycle] is a drawn-out system. I learned the last time I did it [in her last field experience] that although it worked and the kids got something out of it, it takes a long time to really effectively use that system of writing. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

There were many constraining factors within the confines of the informants' classrooms. The influence of those with formal sanctioning power, the pupils, and the lack of time were all factors that limited the actions of the informants. Another level of constraint was the

informants' personal skills at handling the difficulties they encountered.

Personal Level

Clearly, the contexts of the informants' placement sites had a significant impact on the teaching practices of these student teachers. As powerful as the contexts were in shaping the informants towards conservative teaching practices, however, context was not the sole determiner of what took place. The student teacher's own personal qualities helped either to enable or to constrain her whole language perspective.

Several of the informants lacked management skills and found difficulty disciplining students. Others lacked skills in planning activities and delivering classroom instruction. Still others had a hard time breaking free from their student status and tended to follow the lead of their cooperating teachers instead of following their own inner voices.

It must not be assumed that these student teachers were deficient in the personal qualities necessary to be successful teachers. They were novices whose inexperience was understandable. Skills such as managing a room of twenty-five students take time to develop. Each of the informants grew as professionals and demonstrated a greater competency to teach and manage students by the end of their student teaching experience.

By far the most difficult task for the informants was managing students, which many of them admitted was a weak area. As Jane concluded, "They saw me as a friend at first. I made the grave error of being too lenient. I didn't put my foot down at appropriate times. Now I am" (interview with Jane 10/4/89). There were several instances when students misbehaved during the time the informants were teaching them. At such times, the informants concentrated more time and energy into managing students than into planning and teaching.

One way management problems took time and energy away from the student teachers was by causing them emotional distress:

> Rita: Today was kind of a bad day and, I'm attributing it to the snow. But the kids were really wild, almost out of hand. I was so disgusted when I got home. . . .I had two students who just got up and walked out of the room in the middle of a lesson. That is the kind of kids they are. They just don't understand organized classroom behavior, and I don't understand where they got that. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

> Jane: Before lunch there were several instances of poor behavior. Russ was writing bad language on the computer. Ray and Joe were doing nothing, and Nikki was out of her seat running around. I'm really frustrated about what to do. (interview with Jane 10/17/89)

> Karen: Monday was the worst day of my life. It was the first time my cooperating teacher left the room. There were a few kids that acted up all day, no matter what I did. I sent them out in the hall. I yelled at them. They would not behave. . . .It makes me feel like I'm failing. (interview with Karen 10/11/89)

Another way behavior problems took time and energy away from the informants was the constant effort during the day of keeping students under control. Linda admitted that the

biggest problem she had when teaching her second graders was their inability to listen to her and each other (interview with Linda 10/20/89). In an effort to get kids to listen, Linda had students get really quiet and listen to the clicking of the minute hand on the classroom clock (observation of Linda 10/20/89). It took Karen fifteen minutes to quiet down her third grade class before she could begin her social studies lesson. Even then, there were five students who were misbehaving during the lesson, making it hard for the other students to follow the lesson (observation of Karen 10/17/89).

Behavior problems also caused some of the informants to alter their whole language perspectives in favor of more conservative instructional strategies. Rita, who believed in using cooperative groups, had difficulty controlling students when they were engaged in group work:

> They just can't function when they do group work. They get really excited, and they can't stop, so that is basically what happens. Then you have to stop everything, and then the whole class can't do it because two or three can't do it. It's just too many kids for one person to handle. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

Rita's difficulty with handling students during the time they were working in small groups was a common problem among the informants. Karen (see pp. 93-96), Jane (see pp. 110-111), and Linda (see p. 111) also experienced similar difficulties.

Due to their inexperience, the informants struggled at times with planning and delivering instruction. Carol, for

example, had difficulty teaching math in a way that was reflective of her whole language perspective. The math lessons she taught to her fifth graders originated from the basal math book that her cooperating teacher used. After completing her student teaching experience, Carol voiced her dissatisfaction with the way she had taught math, wishing she had had more knowledge on how to teach it:

> I wish he [university's math methods instructor] would have told us more how you would teach whole language math. He [math methods instructor] told us mostly about different computer programs and packages that you could use in the classroom and things like that--not really how to teach it. How to teach math in a whole language way would have been an interesting thing to learn. I don't think my math methods teacher was whole language. (interview with Carol 11/8/90)

Linda struggled with how to teach reading. Her second graders were organized by her cooperating teacher into leveled groups which met for about thirty minutes each day. Knowing the importance of teaching her students to read, Linda was concerned early on in her student teaching experience about how she would accomplishing this goal (interview with Linda 8/22/89). Her concerns persisted as she searched for a method of instruction: "First grade reading--that worries me. If you screw that up, you just messed them up for a long time" (interview with Linda 12/1/89). Linda's apprehensions were compounded by the fact that many of the students in her room had a first grade teacher who had supposedly taught from a whole language perspective the year before, and her students failed to learn important reading skills: "I see so many of those

little kids from first grade who are pitiful. They have no strategies for sounding out words; it is awful" (interview with Linda 12/1/89). Although at the end of her student teaching experience Linda acknowledged that she considered herself a whole language teacher, she wondered if she had missed something in her methods courses that might have informed her about how to plan for and deliver reading instruction (interview with Linda 10/2/89). Linda pursued many different teaching strategies--reading aloud, group discussions, and creative writing--when she taught reading. But she never felt comfortable: "I'm looking for good ideas. . . .I want to see how other teachers teach whole language. People say it can work. I want to see it" (interview with Linda 12/1/89).

Lastly, many of the informants found it difficult to assert their perspectives on teaching. Instead they opted to maintain the existing teaching practices of their cooperating teachers. Karen, for example, was dissatisfied with the way vocabulary was being emphasized over story content: "I don't think they read for meaning; they read to find the answers that you are looking for" (interview with Karen 11/21/89). But she said, "I did do the vocabulary words before we read the next story because that was the way it was done" (interview with Karen 11/21/89). Moreover, Karen admitted: "She [cooperating teacher] never said I had to do it this particular way" (interview with Karen 11/21/89). Despite the fact that her cooperating teacher

never overtly came out and told her to teach in certain ways, Karen, for the most part, maintained the teaching practices of her cooperating teacher. Karen summed up her reasons for doing so:

> I don't think I had the right to go in there and do my own thing. In that setting I never felt welcome. I don't think I would because it isn't my classroom, and I'm not the type of person who would overstep my limits even though my philosophy goes against her philosophy. (interview with Karen 12/14/89)

Personal difficulties with classroom management, planning lessons, delivering instruction, and asserting their teaching perspective over that of their cooperating teachers' perspective all added to the constraints the informants confronted in their placement sites. Besides those constraints that originated within their classrooms and within themselves, these student teachers faced a whole set of constraints that originated within the institution that housed their classrooms.

Institutional Level

There were five different types of institutional constraints that the informants' confronted: shortages of professional personnel, the physical characteristics of classrooms, limited supplies of teaching materials, the school-adopted textbooks, and the ethos of the school. Shortages of professional personnel caused all of the informants except Karen, who had 18 students, to have class sizes between twenty-five and thirty-one students. Linda had thirty-one second graders, which she admitted was too many (interview with Linda 1/15/90). Because of her large

class size, Linda was unable to give as much individual attention to students as she wanted. For example, Linda had a group of eight students, all boys, who had limited reading abilities. Because there were four reading groups, there was simply insufficient time to listen to these particular students.

> This group of kids needed time to talk. They didn't have that. There wasn't a sharing time, and there was [sic] a lot of kids in there that had very serious problems who needed somebody to listen to them. (interview with Linda 12/1/89)

Linda's principal also felt that the second grade class size was too large.

> In second grade this year, we have thirty-one students and a full-time aid. When Mrs. ___ [Linda's cooperating teacher] began teaching that was a normal size class, but back then we taught in a very traditional way, and you didn't really require the space; you didn't provide as much individualization. . . .Now thirty-one seems to make a very crowded classroom and makes it very difficult for teachers to provide for their students. As we see larger class sizes, we are going to see more and more frustrated teachers. (interview with Linda's principal 1/17/90)

Shortages of teachers was not the only employed personnel that the student teachers' placement sites lacked. There was a limited supply of personnel to supervise students during recess, lunch, or the boarding of the bus after school. All the informants were burdened with extra responsibilities of supervision outside the classroom.

In some of the informants' placement sites, the physical characteristics of the classroom made it difficult to carry out certain teaching practices. Linda, for example, had difficulty teaching reading at the table where

reading groups convened because the table was too small to handle the large number of students in the reading groups. Linda complained about how over-crowded the reading groups were, especially a group that had ten students in it.

> Another problem with the reading groups are [sic] they are crowded. I know that each time I have that one group of ten, one of them is going to spend that time in my lap. (interview with Linda 10/23/89)

Linda's university supervisor also noticed problems with the physical arrangement of students for reading groups.

> I watched her [Linda] teach a reading group of seven or so students. . . .Three were paying attention, and the rest were not. I said to myself, "Gosh here are three kids who are in the ozone." I think the seating needed to be arranged differently. (interview with Linda's university supervisor 1/16/90)

Linda was not the only one who experienced difficulties with the physical arrangement of her classroom. Carol had problems as well. Carol had developed a social studies unit in which her fifth graders were engaged in a lot of group work. Although Carol was generally pleased with the quality of work students accomplished in their groups, she felt it would have been better if there had been more space to spread out the groups.

> The groups needed more room to spread out in and to work just in groups instead of bothering other groups. You have to have some way that the class is divided, so the groups can be alone and not worry about the other groups. In this classroom kids were almost touching each other. It was so easy for a lot of the kids in the class to get sidetracked. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

Another limited resource the informants discovered in their institutional settings was a limited supply of children's literature books in multiple copies. All of the

informants acknowledged the importance of getting students to read children's literature. The only multiple copies that the school provided to the classroom teacher, however, were the basal reading books. Of the informants, only Carol Jane, and Rita had their students reading children's literature from a book other than their basal readers.

Carol searched outside the classroom for multiple copies of trade books. She was told by her cooperating teacher that the school only provided the basal textbooks, and did not allocate money for teachers to purchase trade books (interview with Carol 9/5/89). Although Carol was able to round up some multiple copies from the gifted and talented teacher, she was disappointed with the selections available for the lower level reading group.

> The lower level group had fewer choices because there weren't enough copies of anything for their reading level. They read The Wish Giver, but I think they would have rather read something else. When they did get to reading something else, they did better. David, for example, didn't read The Wish Giver at all. But when he got to go to the library and pick his own story, he started reading and reading by himself. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

The lack of multiple copies of children's literature comprised only a small fraction of the way textbooks constrained the informants. The most powerful textbook constraint was the commercially produced basal textbooks that were purchased by the school corporation for their teachers and students. The informants found the basal textbooks dominated the curriculum and instruction in their classroom. Furthermore, Karen, Linda, and Paula found that

the basal textbook determined reading instruction to such an extent that they had little or no influence on how reading was taught.

These commercially produced basal textbooks would not have been such a constraining factor if they were resonant with the whole language perspectives of these student teachers; however, they were not. All of the informants voiced criticisms of the textbooks. Karen did not like the basal reading book that was used to teach reading because of the skill activities that followed each story and because students found the stories uninteresting (interview with Karen 11/21/89). Paula did not like the fact that the workbook which accompanied the basal reading book was used merely as a means to keep students occupied while the teacher worked with reading groups (interview with Paula 9/21/89). Rita complained about the social studies book.

> This social studies book tries to compact so much information in a paragraph its incredible. Today we talked abut the fall of Assyria in one paragraph and then in the next paragraph we talked about how Babylon conquered so and so. All this covered in two paragraphs--about a thousand years worth of history! I said, "I have to apologize to you kids because this is how the book does it." That just flabbergasts me the way it's handled. I said something to my cooperating teacher and she said, "I know, but that's what we have to work with." (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

The degree to which the informants were forced to use the basal textbooks in the delivered curriculum was directly proportional to the beliefs and practices of their cooperating teacher. Karen, Linda, and Paula, who had little freedom to practice their whole language perspectives

during reading instruction, worked with cooperating teachers who both believed in the basal and used it religiously. Paula found early on in her student teaching that her cooperating teacher was a firm believer in the efficiency of the basil reading book. When Paula asked her if she could skip some of the workbook pages, her cooperating teacher told her no. Her cooperating teacher's reasoning focused on the fact that the commercially produced reading program came with a series of tests that students had to pass before advancing to the next level of instruction. If students did not do all of the workbook pages, they would not have exposure to the necessary skills to make these advancements (interview with Paula 9/21/89).

The final institutional constraint was the ethos of the institution itself. Sarason (1982) points out that the existing structure of a setting serves as a barrier to recognition and experimentation with alternative structures. But these structures are not only the result of factors that lie within the confines of the classroom (i.e., the cooperating teacher, students). The school itself has its own culture which can serve as a barrier for certain kinds of teaching practices. The informants were located in three different school buildings. Each of the settings had its own unique ethos, which in turn produced constraints that varied in both degree and kind.

Karen's third grade placement was at Lincoln Park, one of sixty-seven elementary schools located in the inner

city of a large metropolitan area. The school was markedly custodial in the way it controlled student behavior and student learning. Lincoln Park's principal took pride in the fact that students were well behaved at events such as school assemblies. He explained that at Lincoln Park, "We expect them to behave, and we work on getting them to behave" (interview with Karen's principal 6/8/89). Students were monitored during every activity they did. As a way to maintain neat conditions in the rest rooms, large charts were posted outside of them. Teachers took their students to the rest rooms as a class. Prior to the students entering the rest room, teachers made an inspection to make sure nothing was out of order (i.e., no paper towels on the floor, no writing on mirrors, etc.). Teachers would then mark the chart to indicate the condition of the rest room, who last used it, and at what time they had used it (observation of Karen 10/11/89). When students went to lunch, they quietly followed their teacher to the cafeteria in single file lines. Upon entering the cafeteria, students went to designated areas as a class and sat in alphabetically assigned seats. Once seated, students were called up by class in alphabetical order to receive their lunch. After lunch, if the the weather was nice, half the students went outside for recess while the other half had indoor recess (students alternated days in which they had outdoor recess because the outside playground was small). Finally, after their recess was over, students would line up

by class and wait for their teachers to come and get them (observation of Karen 10/4/89).

Controlling the actions of students occurred inside the classroom as well as outside the classroom at Lincoln Park. Karen discovered from observing different classrooms that the teacher-directed lessons that typified the lessons of her cooperating teacher were standard practices throughout the school (interview with Karen 11/16/89). Even when students went to the library, their actions were controlled by structured activities. Once, for example, during library time, students were given a lesson on the importance of alphabetic order by the librarian. After arriving at the library, students sat in designated spots which had the materials they would use (i.e., crayons, ditto sheets and library books) already on the table. In their forty-five minutes in the library, students were directed through three activities: completing two dittos on alphabetizing and alphabetizing a set of six books (observation of Karen 10/11/89).

As earlier mentioned (See pp. 93-96), Karen found that her students rejected or abused any activity in which they were encouraged to show their own initiatives. This student resistance was due in part to the culture of the school. Students had few opportunities at school in which to act independently. When Karen gave them such opportunities, such as going outside to survey the school grounds, they were ill-prepared for the experience.

Linda's school, Gilbert Elementary, was located in a small rural school corporation. Linda's principal explained that two of her goals for the school year were to establish more parent involvement and to help insure a safe school environment (interview with Linda's principal 1/17/90). One means for generating more parent involvement was through class presentations. Each month a class would put together a formal presentation and invite members of the community to watch. Linda and her second grade class were very much involved in helping to establish better parent relations, as their turn to perform came during Linda's student teaching experience (observation of Linda 10/23/89). Consequently, a great deal of time normally spent on classroom instruction was set aside for practicing their presentations. One activity that Linda and her cooperating teacher spent time on was having students practice memorizing several poems and songs that were used as part of the presentation (observation of Linda 9/18/89)

The other goal, establishing a safer environment, also had an effect on Linda. Under the safe-school policy, teachers were required to spend more time supervising children during the times they went to the rest room, went outside for recess, ate their lunch, and went home on the bus (interview with Linda and her cooperating teacher 8/29/89). Linda's typical day of supervising responsibilities would include twenty minutes at lunch, twenty minutes at recess, fifteen minutes taking students to

the rest room, and ten minutes at the end of the day watching students board the bus (observation of Linda 10/12/89).

Also noted earlier (See pp. 90-93), one of the biggest constraints on Linda's teaching perspective was limitation of time. The goals that her principal had built into the culture of the school consumed even more of this precious commodity. The time that Linda spent supervising and getting ready for the class presentations could have been used for planning and delivering some of her whole language learning activities.

College Park Elementary, located in a small Midwestern city of approximately 50,000 people, was the final spot where the informants did their student teaching. Carol, Jane, Paula, and Rita were all located there. An examination of the culture of College Park Elementary serves as a good contrast to the cultures of Lincoln Park and Gilbert Elementary.

College Park Elementary was not as custodial as Lincoln Park. Students had a great deal more freedom. During recess, for example, students in Jane's third grade were given the option of going outside or staying inside. After lunch, Carol let her students come back to the room to play on the classroom computer if they so chose instead of going outside. Rest room breaks for Carol's and Jane's classes were never a supervised event. Students simply went to the rest room when they needed to. Whereas students at Lincoln

Park did not have a single field trip during the time their student teacher was there, the students in Carol's and Jane's rooms went to places almost on a weekly basis--going to such places as the zoo, the historical museum, and the post office. In short, the students at College Park had many more school opportunities to participate in unstructured activities and were thus better prepared to handle learning activities such as group projects and independent learning centers. The student teachers from College Park Elementary found students mostly willing to do their whole language learning activities.

> Carol: The kids were pretty susceptible [sic]. They were willing to change and try something new. The same thing was true with the groups. Although they did have a hard time with it in the beginning, most of them said they liked it, that it beat sitting there and doing work sheets. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

> Rita: The kids at College Park are used to people coming in and trying different things on them. They are good guinea pigs. They just mold and do what you want them to do because they are used to it. That helped make it easier trying to do different things. (interview with Rita 1/16/90)

Time limitations were also not as pronounced at College Park Elementary as they were at Gilbert Elementary. The amount of time that teachers were required to supervise students outside the classroom varied greatly. Students were not supervised as heavily during rest room breaks, and College Park hired special personnel to supervise students at lunch time. Furthermore, there were no school requirements to make any presentations to the parents.

Although Jane and her cooperating teacher did present a play to parents, it was done by choice.

In summery, shortages of personnel, limitation in the physical characteristics of the classroom, limitations of teaching materials, school-adopted textbooks, and the ethos of the school were all constraints found outside the classroom. But institutional constraints were not the only constraints that originated outside the classroom. The informants' classrooms were also affected by state policies.

Cultural Level

Chapter One (pp. 8-15) pointed out that public schools in this country are being dominated by a "technocratic" approach to education that manifests itself in three different ways: 1) an increased emphasis on goals of achievement, especially in areas considered basic such as the 3 Rs; 2) the advent of commercially developed instructional packages that break up complex skills into small steps so that each step can be taken one at a time; and 3) the use of evaluation tools that use "objective" means for demonstrating the effectiveness of what is being taught. Finally, this technocratic approach to curriculum and instruction has a deskilling effect on teachers' work is discussed. In other words, teachers have less autonomy in what they teach and how they teach it.

Given this information, were the informants constrained by this technocratic ideology? The answer is definitely yes. The State Department of Education in the state where

the informants were located had adopted a state competency test which put pressure on individual schools to boost student test scores. All of the informants' cooperating teachers were subjected to the influence of the state mandated tests. Furthermore, each of the informant's schools had adopted commercially produced materials for all the different subject areas. With the exception of Jane's cooperating teacher and, in some instances, Rita's cooperating teacher, all of the cooperating teachers followed the commercially produced materials that were purchased for them.

In 1987, the state enacted a major educational reform package. One of goals of this reform package was to have individual schools increase scores on a state wide competency test. In order to measure performance, The State Board of Education, on September 7, 1989, came out with the following specific goal:

> Increase the average median national percentile ranking of students taking the state competency test, specifically by at least 10 percentile points in grades 6,8,9 and 11 and by at least 5 percentile points in grades 1,2, and 3 by July 1, 1993. (Albert, 9/8/89)

In an attempt to apply additional pressure on individual schools to meet state goals, state officials enacted a performance-based accreditation system along with a system for rewarding schools monetarily. The performance-based accreditation system included two academic criteria that each elementary school must meet in order to gain accreditation: 1) meet state established minimum performance

on the math and language arts portions of the state mandated test, and 2) meet state established minimum performance on the total score of the state competency test (Albert, 10/5/89).

The state's system for rewarding schools features an annual allotment of ten million dollars. In order to receive awards, individual schools must demonstrate improvement in two of four areas: attendance, total performance on the state wide test, language arts scores, and mathematics scores (Albert, 1989 12/15/89).

The pressure on schools to pass accreditation and to win some of the ten million dollars in reward money is enormous, especially since each school's record is public information. Speaking of the impact of the public knowing how individual schools fare, one superintendent from a school corporation in the state said, "People are looking at this as an indictment of the instructional program. When people read this [schools that fail accreditation] in the local news, the misconception is, 'Here is a school with problems'" (Albert, 10/5/89).

The elementary school that had improved its attendance and state competency test scores more than any elementary school in the state from 1987-88 to 1988-89 earned a $34.88 per-pupil award ($12,279 in total). The principal of the school credited the school's improvement to a caring staff, attendance awards given every six weeks, the school's new

computer labs, and good preparation for the state competency test (Albert, 12/19/89).

The principals of the informants' schools felt the pressure of the state competency tests. Linda's principal, who was in charge of a small rural elementary school, spoke on how the test impacted her school:

> I feel like particularly the state competency tests have set us back. Now instead of being able to have an open curriculum across the grades, we can't. Because we know that students are going to be tested on particular things for their proficiencies, it locks us in. We're not very happy about that. As the cooperation grows, it tends to become more centralized. We see more corporation curriculum guides being written. We can still get around some of that because we are a small outlying school and the majority of board members are not that interested in what we are doing as long as our test scores stay where they should. So we can do more than the larger elementary schools in our corporation and get away with it. But we are still feeling the crunch to conform to the traditional curriculum and methods. (interview with Linda's principal 1/17/90)

Pressure to have students do well on the state competency tests was not the only way that the state exerted its influence. The state, to a large degree, also controlled the instructional materials used in the classroom. Linda's principal spoke about the way her school's instructional materials were being controlled by the state:

> The way that the textbook adoption operates now is that the state gives school corporations everything that they will adopt, and you have to adopt something from that list. Those tend to be basals. All materials tend to be traditional textbook materials, so when you adopt something you're locked into State Board of Accounts. The way they say you have to handle your textbook rental is first of all, it has to be something from your adoption list; then once you have adopted it, that goes on your rental list, and you charge parents

> for that. If you charge them for it, you have to provide it. We have had a bit of flexibility there; however, it was tightened this year because we had a new reading adoption. What is probably going to happen to us soon is in the next year or two our textbook accounts will be handled centrally. All of the ordering will happen from central office. All of the payments will be fed into central office. While I'm handling it, I can provide some degree of flexibility. For example, if the workbooks are crummy, I can provide something of equal value in place of the workbook, and we can get away with that to some degree. I won't be able to get away with that any more. (interview with Linda's principal 1/17/89)

The state competency tests (a battery of different tests) that were given during the year were a powerful means of controlling the way curriculum was conceived and carried out in the informants' classrooms. It was only in Carol's fifth grade placement site that the influence of the state competency tests were negligible--a predictable outcome given that the state did not test fifth graders.

Similar to their reaction to the commercially-produced basal textbooks, the informants were critical of the state competency tests because they were incompatible with their whole language perspective. Paula discovered, much to her chagrin, that the process approach to writing she aspired to teach was not supported by the state competency tests:

> The writing sample [test for written competency] was so stupid. They expected the students to write an expository essay, with correct punctuation, spelling, etc., and to do all this on the <u>first</u> [emphasis added] copy. (interview with Rita 12/13/89)

The student teachers were not the only ones to disagree with these tests; their cooperating teachers voiced criticisms as well:

> Teaching to the test--that is what we are doing here. Even me, who really resents testing situations. Since we have to do it, there is no way around it. I can give grades on that grade card from all the projects we do; I don't have to test them for one minute. But the state competency tests are something that they are going to have to face, so they are going to have to be ready for it. (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89)

Despite student teachers' resentment of the state competency tests, tests were frequently responsible for changes in the informants' teaching process. A good example to illustrate this impact happened in Jane's third grade placement site during a math activity. One of the questions students were to answer called for students to write 2x6=12 another way. One student, Derrick, wrote 2+2+2+2+2+2=12. Jane commented to her cooperating teacher that Derrick's answer was indeed correct. Jane's supervising teacher, however, knowing that the question was looking for 6x2=12, voiced her concern: "You better let him [Derrick] know that there is another answer for that because that is another one that is on the test [state competency test]" (observation of Jane 11/8/89).

Preparing the children for the state competency exams was a common occurrence in the informants' placement sites. Karen, for example, was urged by her cooperating teacher to spend a lot of time working with the third graders on building better vocabulary. The students from the year before had tested below grade level on the state competency exam (interview with Karen and her cooperating teacher 10/4/89). Thus, Karen's cooperating teacher had decided to make vocabulary building one of her top priorities for the

year (interview with Karen 9/25/89). A typical reading lesson had students going over the new vocabulary found in their story. Vocabulary was taught through work sheets that accompanied the basal reader. Teacher and students would orally go over the work sheet, and then students would be assigned to complete the work sheets on their own (observation of Karen 10/4/89).

Summary

Chapter Four has delineated the many constraining factors that the informants faced during their student teaching experience. First, a vignette depicting an area of constraint from each of the key informants has been presented as a way of illustrating the individual struggles that each had within her specific context. Next, the different categories of constraining factors that cut across all of the informants' experiences was outlined. While most of the data from this research dealt with the micro-level (interactive and personal), an attempt was made to link the macro-level (institutional and cultural) with the micro-level. Clearly classrooms can not be understood in isolation from the society at large. The evidence shows that the state had a very direct influence on what happened in the individual classroom where the informants did their student teaching.

The next chapter will examine the social strategies that the key informants adopted to deal with the constraints that they found in their student teaching experience. In

addition, those factors that helped enable the informants to manifest their perspectives will be outlined.

RESPONSES

"I felt the tone of chapter four was somewhat negative. This is partially due to the nature of the chapter topic. My student teaching experience was a positive experience, and even in spite of the difficulties, I wouldn't want to give the impression that the experience was negative. I feel that even unpleasant experiences can be fruitful. One can learn from someone else's opinions and thoughts, whether agreeable or not." (personal correspondence with Rita 7/3/90)

"Interesting work! Something that came to mind was the training of the _____ University Supervisors. With rare exception, they are disruptive for both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher (However, there are these "rare" exceptions!). Their (university supervisors') power of life/death over the student teacher is more of an influence than the classroom teacher.

I don't think that a student teacher with a whole language perspective will lose his/her teaching perspective in one semester if they are placed in a traditional classroom. It actually provides a nice comparative study." (personal correspondence with Paula 6/16/90)

"Chapter Four was clear. I was able to follow your points and the examples supported your conclusions well.

Through my first reading, I got depressed. I felt as if, once again, I hadn't accomplished anything during my student teaching that was worthwhile. It made me start thinking of what I got out of the experience: ideas on discipline, what not to do with the teaching of language arts, etc.

One thing that bothered me is the number of constraints that you pointed out that don't just concern student teachers but all teachers: school philosophies, cultural values, state guidelines, and standardized testing. Teachers are prepared for four years to become a professional and learn a great many theories but our limitations in putting our professional knowledge and theories to use seem endless.

I am awaiting your next chapter, so I can begin feeling that there is some hope in coping with the constraints." (personal correspondence with Karen 6/12/90)

"This chapter was really informative. I felt like you did a good job of presenting your information. You were also able to do a good job of supporting your theories." (personal correspondence with Jane 6/18/90)

"It was like a much needed group counselling meeting to read the experiences of similar cohorts. It helped put several events into a better perspective. The reading of

this material is like a perfect culminating experience for us as student teachers.

Don't you think the influence from the state will change somewhat in buildings as administrators empower the teachers to make more of their own decisions?" (personal correspondence with Linda 6/23/90)

"All of us [informants in this study] commented on the problem of not enough time to plan and implement whole language instruction. I find this to still be true with my new fifth grade position. I do have the summer to get ready for next year and that will help. It would be nice if student teachers could plan things during the summer in preparation for their student teaching experience.

Now that I have my own classroom I still experiment with styles and methods; however, I feel more freedom to do this in my own classroom.

I think I was most concerned about my evaluation because I didn't get enough feedback over the course of student teaching. My cooperation teachers and university supervisor said, 'Your doing find.' What actually does fine mean? I guess I need reinforcement like the kids.

I still think they [teacher education] need to teach more ways to handle behavior problems in school and how to keep groups on task. Students need (crave) so much more attention than I would have ever imagined.

At least we had multiple copies of trade books when I was doing my student teaching. Now I have to buy my own or scrounge from library to library.

I feel fortunate that I did my student teaching in fifth grade and am currently teaching fifth grade. Thus I do not have the constraint of the state competency tests. That would just be another added form of institutionalized instruction.

Math is still my weakest subject. In order to compensate, I am attending "Math Their Way" this summer. I feel like I didn't get any formal instruction from my teacher preparation program. I feel very strongly about this. Math is such a serious subject; I didn't feel like I was qualified to teach it prior to student teaching." (personal correspondence with Carol 7/10/90)

CHAPTER FIVE

SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND ENABLING FACTORS

In light of the array of constraining factors the informants encountered in their placement sites, how did they reconcile their whole language perspectives with the demands of their placement sites? As noted in Chapter One (See pp. 20-23), most initial research on the socialization of student teachers shows student teachers giving up their liberal ideas learned at the university and adopting the conservative view of pedagogy that exists in their placement sites (e.g., How & Rees, 1977; Griffin, et al., 1983; Hodges, 1982). Unlike the student teachers in the above research, these informants continued to verbally support their original beliefs about whole language. It must be noted, however, that because of various constraints, all the informants were forced at times--some more than others--to temporarily abandon their whole language perspectives and teach in more traditional ways. Three questions serve as the basis for Chapter Five: To what degree were the informants able to manifest their whole language perspective?; How were these student teachers able to keep their original whole language philosophies alive?; and What factors enabled them to do so? As a means for better understanding just how and to what degree the informants were able to maintain their whole language perspectives, the social strategies and options they adopted to deal with the environmental constraints they encountered will be

addressed. Following this discussion, those factors which helped enable the informants to practice their whole language perspectives will be looked at.

Strategies and Options Used During Student Teaching

Lacy (1977) used the construct social strategies as a way of understanding how beginning teachers were socialized into the profession of teaching. He (1977, pp. 67-8) defines a social strategy as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers in light of those constraining factors they encounter. The implication of his view of socialization--the view used in this study--is that the constraints of the situation and the individual's purpose within that situation must be taken into account.

In his study of pre-service teachers, Goodman (1988) found the following five strategies used by beginning teachers as they reconciled their own beliefs with the school system's expectations: 1) overt compliance, 2) critical compliance, 3) accommodative resistance, 4) resistant alteration, and 5) transformative action. Goodman's findings revealed that the school system's expectations for the teachers in his study were controlled to a large extent by a prefigured curriculum that all teachers were expected to use:

> These instructional programs indicated that in addition to specifying the content to be studied, they also strongly influenced the instructional activity of both the teacher and pupils. These programs came complete with specific learning objectives, step-by-step procedures, time schedules, and tests--all organized for the teachers' and pupils' implementation. (p. 28)

The beginning teachers in Goodman's study, however, had all been selected because of their initial beliefs that teachers should be active participants in the development and implementation of curriculum not just passive deliverers of predetermined curricula. Therefore, his informants faced teaching environments that ran counter to their teaching beliefs. As a way to reconcile these differences, they adopted one or more of the above strategies. Goodman (1988) goes on to explain the parameters of each of these five strategies. Overt compliance refers to a strategy in which beginning teachers "focused their energies on finding out how to follow the instructional programs used in their classrooms" (p. 31). This strategy indicates those situations where individuals willingly developed into the kind of persons the situation demanded, and their socialization entailed "internal adjustment of their own beliefs to comply with the district's expectations" (Goodman, 1988, p. 31). When using the strategy of critical compliance, beginning teachers complied with the instructional practices in their field sites, but, unlike overt compliance "did not adjust their thinking as a result of having to follow standardized procedures" (Goodman, 1988, p. 32).

Whereas the first two strategies exhibited compliance on the part of the prospective teachers, the last three strategies demonstrated different degrees of resistance. Accommodative resistance occurred when beginning teachers

"developed small, incidental activities that would provide an alternative to the drill work that dominated classroom instruction" (Goodman, 1988, p. 33). The major indicator in accommodative resistance was that efforts of resistance did not significantly alter the standard curriculum or the nature of instruction. On the other hand, using strategic resistance alteration, "pre-service teachers not only looked for ways to break the instructional routine of drill work but also made decisions concerning the content taught in their lessons" (Goodman, 1988, p. 33). Lastly, transformative action was the most comprehensive form of resistance. When employing this tactic, beginning teachers seriously reflected on what should be taught to their students, planned, and implemented an entire unit of study.

Goodman's five categories were used to understand the different strategies the informants used to negotiate their way through the environmental constraints they encountered during their student teaching experience. It must be noted, however, that not all of the informants faced environments that were incongruent with their perspectives. Both Jane and Rita were placed with cooperating teachers who resisted the predetermined curricula provided by the teacher's manuals. Moreover, they supported many of the whole language ideas that Jane and Rita believed in. As a result, Jane and Rita did not always have to use strategic ploys to deal with an incompatible teaching environment. Instead, they chose to use, on occasion, two other options that will

be added to Goodman's categories: corresponding compliance and encouraged curricular action. Corresponding compliance occurred when the student teacher chose to go along with the teaching practices found in his/her placement site because they corresponded to his/her own perspective on teaching. Encouraged curricular action is when the student teacher opted to significantly alter the content and/or instruction in a subject area because his/her cooperating teacher encouraged him/her to do so. As one might expect, given the fact that the informants were purposefully selected for their knowledge and commitment to the principles of whole language, the strategy of overt compliance was not used; instead the informants elected to use a variety of the other strategies and options during the course of their student teaching (See Figure 2, for a listing of all the strategies and options each informant used).

Critical Compliance

Critical compliance was used by all of the informants at one time or another during their student teaching. There were many times when the informants felt they had to comply with the "way things were done" even though they were opposed to the teaching practices. Often during such disagreements, the informants would fantasize about how they would do things differently. Karen, for example, was critical of the way reading instruction was carried out.

Figure 2 Strategies and options used by the informants during their student teaching experience

	Jane	Carol	Karen	Linda	Rita	Paula
Encouraged Curricular Action	X				X	
Corresponding Compliance	X	X			X	
Transformative Action		X				
Resistant Alteration		X		X	X	X
Accommodative Resistance	X	X	X	X	X	X
critical compliance	X	X	X	X	X	X
Overt compliance						

In her third grade class, the commercially produced reading materials dominated instruction to such an extent that even the type of questions asked by the teacher were predetermined by the teacher's manual. Karen was critical of the kinds of questions that pupils were asked to respond to:

> The questions all seemed to be "what" questions. For example, in the story about the little girl and the gondola, the question was, 'What is she doing?' Maybe a better question would have been, 'What do you think is going to happen next?' Then they would have to do their own thinking and draw their own conclusions. Another thing they could have been asked to do that might have been better is writing endings to stories. That way they would have to come up with their own conclusion. (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

The distinguishing factor for this strategy was that no attempts were made to carry out these fantasies in their field sites; instead, the informants reluctantly accommodated the teaching practices that were in place. Although the strategy of critical compliance did not alter the classroom experiences of pupils, it was extremely important. It gave the informants a way to maintain their whole language philosophy instead of giving it up to those forces which were pressing them to conform.

Accommodative Resistance

Often times when confronted with having to teach in a way that was in disagreement with their whole language perspective, the informants resorted to making minor alterations in the way instruction was delivered. Carol, for example, discovered early on that her cooperating teacher wanted her to follow the lessons laid out in the spelling book (interview with Carol 9/5/89). As a way of trying to alter spelling in hopes of making it more whole language, Carol helped a group of poor spellers compose a story out of the list of spelling words provided by the spelling book. Carol instructed a student to start off the story by thinking of a sentence which contained one of the spelling words. Another student would add the next sentence, which also contained a spelling word, until all the spelling words were used (interview with Carol 9/5/89). Additionally, Carol altered the spelling routine by having students guess the next spelling word while taking the

weekly spelling test. If, for example, the spelling word was "ceiling," Carol would give the clue: "This is at the top of our classroom." Students would raise their hands and guess until they got the correct word. After Carol acknowledged the guess was correct, students would fill in "ceiling" on their spelling test (observation of Carol 10/6/89).

Making alterations, however slight, enabled the informants to reconcile their philosophy with opposing teaching practices. For Karen, this strategy seemed extremely important:

> If I wouldn't have [sic] been able to do anything [alter the routines of her cooperating teacher], I would have left [walked out of student teaching] a long time ago. . . .I wouldn't be happy teaching if I totally gave up on my ideas. (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

Resistance Alteration

There were several instances when some of the informants significantly altered the content of lessons. Linda, for example, changed the content in the ten learning centers in her second grade room. Her cooperating teacher, who had been using centers for several years, explained her view of learning centers: "Learning centers really aren't the right name; they are more like practice centers because the kids are practicing their skills at the centers" (interview with Linda's cooperating teacher 9/29/89). Moreover, Linda's cooperating teacher liked to integrate the particular skills they were learning in math and language arts with the centers around the room (interview with

Linda's cooperating teacher 10/2/89). Similarly, Linda wanted to tie the learning centers together; however, instead of using skills as the focus, she wanted to use content. One week she changed all the learning centers to activities that centered around dinosaurs. There was a lunch pail set up that contained several bones submerged in sand. Students, pretending they were paleontologists, used a toothbrush to find the ancient dinosaur bones. After uncovering the bones, students examined them with magnifying lenses and then wrote any questions they had about "dinosaur digs." There was another center which contained several fact books on dinosaurs. Students were to peruse the books and learn at least one "dinosaur fact" that they would later tell the class. Dinosaurs were featured in other learning centers by way of cassette tapes, filmstrips, and ditto work sheets. One ditto work sheet had six scenes depicting the stages a paleontologist must go through in order to assemble the bones of a dinosaur for a museum exhibit. Students were instructed to cut out the scenes and sequence them (observation of Linda 10/2/89).

Linda was encouraged by the student's response to learning about different animals: "It is exciting to me that the kids are taking this stuff home with them and talking about it at home" (interview with Linda 9/30/89). Linda was also encouraged when students brought things to school, such as a book about dinosaurs, which corresponded to the particular animal they were studying (interview with Linda

10/2/89). Linda was not the only one who noticed the students' excitement; her cooperating teacher noticed it, too. Picking up on Linda's idea of having students act as "researchers," Linda's cooperating teacher set aside a special time during the day in which students could report their observations to the class (observation of Linda 9/18/89). When asked if she was learning from her student teacher, she responded, "Oh yes, I'm learning and benefiting from her. I'm profiting from all the files [on animals] that she has done, and I'm going to continue doing the animal units now" (interview with Linda's cooperating teacher 10/2/89). For Linda, the strategy of resistance alteration not only allowed her to alter the content of the learning centers but also helped to motivate students and open new curricular horizons for her cooperating teacher.

Transformative Action

Carol was the only informant who was able to plan and implement an entire unit of study that altered the way curriculum and instruction were typically carried out by her cooperating teachers. One area she transformed in her fifth grade placement was reading. Both of her cooperating teachers used the commercially produced basal reading series, but Carol never used the basal series; instead, she used children's trade books. Along with reading the trade books, students discussed them, wrote creative stories, illustrated certain scenes from their trade books, composed

poetry, presented "book talks" to their classmates, and self-evaluated the work they completed.

When asked why she chose to teach reading differently, Carol's simple explanation was "because I think it works better" (interview with Carol 9/14/89). She gained the freedom to implement her "better" ideas by showing her cooperating teachers some of the materials she had collected in her language arts methods course as well as a language arts conference she had attended. In Carol's words, her cooperating teachers were "impressed" with what she had to show them (interview with Carol 9/5/89).

As a result of using the strategy of transformative action, Carol's cooperating teachers discovered her teaching methods were effective. One of her cooperating teachers commented: "Carol is one of the most creative student teachers that I have ever had. I would have pulled back the reins a little bit more if she hadn't been so good" (interview with Carol's cooperating teacher 10/16/89). Another benefit of using this strategy was the confidence it instilled in Carol. When asked after her student teaching if she felt prepared to be a full-time teacher, she responded: "I'm confident I could do it; I'm ready" (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

Corresponding Compliance

Whereas the above strategies were used when the informants faced constraints in their environments, there were instances when some of the informants' environments

were conducive to whole language teaching practices. Obviously, the best option for informants to take when their cooperating teacher resisted the skills-based approach found in the teacher's manual and used whole language teaching practices instead was to continue teaching in like fashion. Jane, for example, worked with a cooperating teacher whose philosophy, for the most part, corresponded to her own. Jane's cooperating teacher believed in using a lot of letter writing in her class. Students wrote letters to each other, their teacher, their parents, and to special people such as the President. Jane's cooperating teacher explained her process-approach to writing: "I don't spend a lot of time on the technicalities at first. I lead them into that later as it becomes necessary" (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89). Jane also believed in having students do a lot of writing and agreed that the process of writing was just as important, if not more important, than the product (interview with Jane 12/18/89). Therefore, when Jane was given opportunities to work with students, she continued to stress process by writing letters to students and having them write her back (observation of Jane 9/12/89). Jane further supported letter writing through a project in which she set up penpals for each student with elderly folks from a nearby retirement home (observation of Jane 10/25/89).

Because Jane's placement site was so similar to her ideal classroom, she used the option of correspondence compliance often. As a result, she experienced many of her

beliefs, such as the process-approach to writing, being put into practice. Through this first-hand experience of seeing her ideas in practice and then working with her ideas, Jane became even more committed to her whole language perspective. For example, Jane talked about her belief in cooperative learning:

> Yes, I believe in that [cooperative learning]. That is a big idea from whole language. But I <u>really</u> [emphasis added] believe in it from my own personal experience and from what I observed from watching my cooperating teacher. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

Jane's cooperating teacher felt that the experience Jane received while doing student teaching made a lasting impression:

> Knowing that she went through this classroom, that she has the background, she'll say to herself, "I know it works; I've seen it." She'll keep reaching for it. I think she is determined to reach for it. (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89)

<u>Encouraged Curricular Action</u>

There were instances where some of the informants were encouraged by their cooperating teacher to plan and implement an original learning activity. Both Jane and Rita had such opportunities. Jane's cooperating teacher told her at the beginning of the year that she should do one major project (interview with Jane 11/8/89). Jane decided to have students write their own books (See pp. 61-62). Jane's cooperating teacher explained her thoughts about the major project:

> I've always done that; and it's always different, because I get bored easily. Last year the student teacher put together a newspaper. This year Jane did

> the books. (interview with Jane's cooperating teacher 12/20/89)

Rita also received encouragement from her cooperating teachers. Rita explained that she "had a lot of free reign," and that, "If I wanted to try something new, my cooperating teachers welcomed that as a learning experience for the students" (interview with Rita 1/16/90). One area in which Rita was encouraged to explore her ideas was reading. Rita's group of twenty sixth graders read two children's trade books: My Side of the Mountain and Julie of the Wolves. During Rita's stint as the student teacher, students did several learning activities. Besides reading and discussing the trade books, Rita had students do such activities as writing their own endings to Julie of the Wolves and illustrating and describing the living quarters of the main character in My Side of the Mountain (interview with Rita 12/13/89). Rita was encouraged by the students' response to reading the two trade books. In fact, Rita found that when she tested students on their comprehension of the trade books, they did much better than they did on a similar test for a story they read in their basil reading books (interview with Rita 12/13/89). By exercising their options in terms of encouraged curricular action, Rita and Jane gained the experience of planning and implementing their own learning activities. Their experiences were valuable, for it gave them concrete evidence that their ideas were both possible and worthwhile.

In summation, the informants used the above strategies and options to help them maintain and, in some instances, strengthen their original whole language perspectives. The fact that not one of the informants used overt compliance is testimony to the commitment they had to their whole language perspectives. The next section will look at those factors that helped them maintain this commitment to whole language teaching practices.

Enabling Factors

In light of the many constraints documented in Chapter Four, it is not hard to understand why many beginning teachers give up the liberal ideas they have learned at the university and adopt the conservative view of pedagogy that exists in their placement sites. As was found in this study as well as others (e.g., Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985; Goodman, 1988; and Lacey 1977), however, not all student teachers' original perspectives were washed out during their student teaching experience. This finding is extremely important. By delineating the factors that enable some student teachers to maintain their perspectives, teacher preparation programs so inclined can work to create conditions that will allow more beginning teachers to maintain their liberal ideas. Zeichner & Tabachnick (1985) speak to the importance of discovering what these conditions are.

> The most hopeful implication of this study is that a loss of idealism is not an inevitable result of induction into teaching and that the efforts of formal teacher preparation programs are not necessarily in

> vain. Under some conditions at least it appears possible for beginning teachers to find or to create opportunities for the expression of their ideals. How to create and maintain the conditions which will enhance those individual expressions of teaching perspectives which are encouraged in our preparation programs is the challenge offered by the results of this research. (p. 19-20)

The data collected in this study suggest the following five categories of enabling factors which encouraged the informants to maintain their whole language perspectives: favorable pupil responses, institutional support, teacher education programs, personal dispositions for reflective teaching, and support from a mentoring relationship.

Favorable Pupil Responses

The informants continued to put trust in their whole language methods when they observed their pupils benefiting from their endeavors to teach whole language. Karen, for example, whose second grade class typically performed below her expectations, did notice an occasional bright spot in her student's learning. During a science lesson dealing with endangered species, Karen put two questions on the board: Why is your animal endangered?; What are people doing to help this animal? Students who had previously done some research on an endangered animal were to look at their notes and answer the questions (observation of Karen 10/17/89). Karen was pleased with the students' responses.

> I was really pleased at what they did with it because at the end, they all had clear concise sentences that said these animals are endangered because of such and such, and people are doing this and that. Without me telling them, they were able to do it. . . .For them to write a concise sentence that stated a point was great for me. (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

For Karen, such an occasional bright spots was very important because it kept alive her whole language perspective.

> I like to look at growth. If I can see a little spark of something new of what the kids are doing, that really gives me a boost in my day. It makes me feel like I'm having some impact on their lives. (interview with Karen 11/21/89)

Carol's fifth graders encouraged her to act on her whole language perspective. Carol observed, just after she had taken on some of the teaching responsibilities, that students were bored and confused with much of the science instruction they were receiving.

> We read the chapter, and we write it on the board. That is really boring. The whole class almost failed their last two tests because they don't know how to outline and study. When I look at the kids, and they stare at me with those blank faces, I feel like it isn't going anywhere. So I think, let's do more exciting things and move around and tie things together. It makes me feel better that they are alive and interested. (interview with Carol 5/14/89)

Carol's attempts at making science more interesting by tying together the science activities with the subject matter they were learning--something her cooperating teacher failed to do--produced favorable student responses. For example, in one science lesson, the fifth grade class was studying the different classifications of animals. Carol's cooperating teacher, who was teaching the other fifth grade science in the afternoon, scheduled an experiment in which students were to measure the distance of each other's standing broad jump. Carol, on the other hand, convinced her cooperating teacher to let her perform an experiment for the morning

science class in which students would work in groups of four dissecting a fish. Students worked very well in their groups and learned such things as fish have backbones like other vertebrates and air bladders help fish control the depth at which they are submerged in water (observation of Carol 9/26/89). When this researcher asked students how they liked the experiment, all of them acknowledged that it was fun. One student indicated it was the best experiment he had done so far (observation of Carol 9/26/89). Moreover, Carol was pleased with the behavior of students during the experiment. She was especially pleased when a boy named David, who Carol admitted "doesn't know how to act with other people," was able to finish his experiment sheet (interview with Carol 9/26/89).

Seeing favorable pupil responses was perhaps the most important ingredient in the preservation of the informants' perspectives. Without the concrete experiences of seeing their pupils become more enlivened and more sophisticated as a result of implementing their whole language teaching strategies, it is doubtful that these student teachers would have continued to maintain their whole language perspectives.

Institutional Support

Although many schools are stifling settings in which to work, it is important to remember that not all schools and classrooms are alike. Jane, for example, found a much greater degree of curricular freedom in her third grade

placement site than Karen found in her inner-city third grade or Linda found in her rural second grade placement site. Therefore, the degree to which the informants were able to manifest their perspectives depended largely on the amount of curricular freedom they were able to gain in their placement sites. Curricular freedom was greater in those placement sites which supported and/or encouraged the informants to try out their own ideas in the classroom. For those informants who were given curricular freedom, the primary institutional support person was their cooperating teacher. Other forms of institutional support included other building teachers, library resources, and institutional sponsored workshops.

The informants found that the primary custodian of curriculum and instruction was the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher's beliefs on what his/her role as a cooperating teacher was and his/her beliefs on how curriculum and instruction should be enacted determined how much curricular freedom the informants received. Jane, Rita, and Carol, who manifested the most whole language instruction, were given the most curricular freedom by their cooperating teachers. Both Jane and Rita had cooperating teachers who resisted the prefigured curricula of the commercially produced teacher's manuals and opted instead to teach using many of the instructional strategies supported by whole language philosophy. For them, by simply teaching

in ways resembling their cooperating teacher, they were able to be true to their teaching philosophies.

The way Rita and her cooperating teacher taught reading serves as a good example. At the beginning of her student teaching, Rita explained how her cooperating teacher expected her to teach reading.

> She [cooperating teacher] uses literature circles and authoring cycles a lot. She doesn't use basals very much at all. She told me that I would be totally responsible for one [reading group], and she told me that I'd be using text sets [children's trade books] for the most part. I'm excited about it because I'll be able to do some of the things I really want to do. (interview with Rita 8/22/89)

When Rita did get her chance to teach reading, she used children's trade books and had students doing several whole language learning activities such as writing endings to stories and illustrating certain scenes from their trade books (interview with Rita 12/13/89).

Carol, who like Rita and Jane had a lot of curricular freedom, did not have a cooperating teacher who demonstrated whole language teaching practices. However, both of her cooperating teachers, Dick and Connie, supported her whole language ideas. Dick explained his role as a cooperating teacher:

> I want student teachers to find themselves. I don't want them to be like me. I want them to take chances. I tell them it is okay to fail. (interview with Carol's cooperating teacher 9/12/89)

Moreover, even though both of Carol's cooperating teachers used the commercially produced basal readers, they were critical of them. Carol recounted one incident when Connie

spoke up during a reading workshop and told other teachers that the commercially produced basals were "brainwashing" them into believing reading could only be taught one way (interview with Carol 10/6/89). Dick was also critical of basals. It was his belief that the best way for fifth graders to learn to read was by reading real literature. Dick would have liked to see the school purchase more trade books instead of supplying the basal reading series that was currently in place (interview with Carol's cooperating teacher 10/16/89).

Each of the other informants had varying degrees of curricular freedom but found very few curricular opportunities in the subjects of reading and math. Linda's cooperating teacher, for example, was intent on having her students do several skill sheets on a daily basis in the areas of language arts and math. Linda explained her cooperating teacher's rationale:

> She has put everything down in those two areas because she knows how many of those kids on the average graduate from high school. She wants them to do well on standardized tests and make it in the world. (interview with Linda 1/15/90)

Therefore, it was in the areas of science and social studies, not language arts, that Paula, Linda, and Karen were given the most freedom by their cooperating teachers to manifest their whole language perspectives. Paula, for example, did a research project with her second graders on endangered species. Students, working in small groups of six, went to the library and collected information on a

particular endangered animal. Group members shared the responsibility for gathering the information with each member concentrating on a different question such as where does it live? What does it eat? What can we do to prevent it from being endangered? After compiling their data, the group was responsible for writing a short report (interview with Paula 9/21/89).

It is significant that the three informants with the most curricular freedom--Jane, Carol, and Rita--all did their student teaching at College Park Elementary. In addition to having cooperating teachers that gave them support, College Park Elementary offered three other kinds of institutional support. First was the support offered by other teachers in their building. College Park had several teachers who used whole language teaching instruction in their classrooms. Moreover, these teachers were willing to share their ideas and materials with the student teachers. Carol, for example, used many of the ideas of her College Park colleagues.

> I felt really comfortable about asking teachers for things. I guess they didn't see me as any kind of threat because they were more than willing to give me suggestions. For The Book of Three, I went to see Mrs. W____, who does The Book of Three, and she gave me all of her notes. I compiled them with all my notes which made a better unit. It cut down on my work a bit because I used some of her things. I can only think up so many good ideas by myself. I need someone else's input too. So I think that worked a lot. Talking with all those teachers really worked. (interview with Carol i1/8/89)

Moreover, Carol also got ideas from Jane's cooperating teacher on how to organize the classroom so that it would be

more conducive for small group discussions (observation of Carol 11/3/89). From Rita's cooperating teacher, Carol learned how to provide more individualization when teaching math (interview with Carol 11/8/89), and from Paula's cooperating teacher, she learned of a way to integrate spelling with other subjects (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

Secondly, College Park offered support by providing a large library with a full-time librarian. All of the children's trade books that Carol used to teach reading came from the library. In addition, Carol, Paula, and Rita used the library for research projects for their students. In both Carol's and Paula's projects, the librarian assisted them by gathering materials and helping children search for data. (observation of Carol 9/26/89, interview with Paula 11/4/89)

Finally, teachers at College Park were provided opportunities to attend workshops throughout the semester. The workshops were sources for ideas as well as places for teachers to voice their opinions. Jane, Rita, and Carol attended some of these workshops and discovered ideas to use in the classroom. For instance, Carol used a science experiment on bird feathers which she picked up when attending one of these workshops (interview with Carol 10/6/89). In another workshop that both Carol and Rita attended, some of the teachers in attendance voiced criticism of the basal reading book's skill-based approach

(interview with Rita 10/19/89 & interview with Carol 10/6/89).

Obviously College Park Elementary offered support for those informants placed there. Three out of four--Paula being the exception--had cooperating teachers who gave them a high degree of curricular freedom to explore their whole language perspectives. With the help of the library facilities, even Paula was able to achieve a degree of freedom in the areas of science and social studies. The support Karen and Linda found in their schools--Lincoln Park and Gilbert Elementary--was significantly less than College Park. Perhaps the biggest reason for the positive College Park experience was due to the fact that College Park had a group of teachers who supported whole language instruction whereas the other schools did not have such a group. This College Park group had established informal networks that reached out beyond their classrooms and lent support to those aspiring to use whole language teaching strategies.

Teacher Education Program

The traditional view of teacher education in this country asserts that teacher preparation can do little to counteract the "apprenticeship of observation" that teachers come away with from the more than 10,000 hours of exposure to classroom life they stored up as pupils (Lortie, 1975). Contrary to this view, the informants pre-service methods courses were a significant factor in helping these student teachers develop their whole language perspectives.

In addition, the informants had several field experiences which were taken in conjunction with these methods courses. Thus, the informants, ideally, could spend time in the classroom learning about different aspects of the teaching/learning process and then attempt to ground their theoretical orientations in the real world of classroom practice. Although this ideal did not always result, there were several instances where the informants' perspectives were strengthened by this theory/practice model. Jane, for example, learned the merits of the writing cycle in her field placement site.

> Researcher: Didn't you do some whole language instruction in your field placement?
> Jane: Yes, I initiated the writing cycle, and it worked. That was the first time in my mind when I knew that it [writing] was a process like the book I had been reading said it was. (interview with 12/18/89)

Karen saw, first hand, the advantages of cooperative grouping during a lesson she taught when she was doing her field experience.

> Right now in my field experience, we have second graders looking through encyclopedias and other reference books. A lot of them [reading materials] are above their level, but the good readers help the poor readers read things. When I saw this, I was really amazed because it was more than I had expected them to do. (interview with Karen 4/4/89)

Not surprisingly, Jane and Karen attempted to put these ideas, which were learned in methods courses and reinforced in the field, into practice in their student teaching. Jane had her third grade students go through the different phases of the authoring cycle (See pp. 61-62), and Karen had her

third graders working in groups researching endangered animals (See pp. 64-65).

All of the informants pointed to their methods courses when discussing the underpinnings for their whole language perspective. Karen, for example, took Reading Methods I her junior year, a course that helped her "dissolve old thought patterns" (interview with Karen 9/19/89). Prior to this course, Karen had not been introduced to whole language. But after taking it, she began thinking about teaching and learning much differently. During her Reading Methods II, Karen was given an assignment in which she had to describe her ideal classroom.

> I thought that assignment was very worthwhile. That assignment made me come up with my philosophy. Before doing this assignment for Reading Methods II, I got out my dumb philosophy paper that I had to write for my Ed Psych course my sophomore year. This was before I started getting into whole language. Basically that paper was just Ed Psych stuff. I just tried to please the teacher. I included everything that was good in the book. I just kept pulling out all these things from the book and not really what was going to go on in my classroom or what I believed teaching was. I laugh at that paper now. (interview with Karen 11/30/89)

Like Karen, Carol's whole language perspective came together during her reading methods courses. Her Reading Methods II instructor had a profound impact on her. During her student teaching, Carol admitted to hearing the echo of her college instructor. "Whenever I do something [in the classroom], I hear E_____'s [Carol's Reading II Methods instructor] voice saying, 'Is that whole language?'" (interview with Carol 9/15/89). Moreover, Carol pointed to her methods courses as being one of the main reasons she was so successful in

manifesting much of her whole language perspective in her fifth grade placement.

> I felt really confident that the kind of things I was trying would be good for the kids. I guess most of that is from E____ [Reading Methods II instructor]. Just going to some of the meetings she took us to and also listening to Dr. H____ [Reading Methods I instructor] talk a lot. He was really against basals and that kind of thing. Even my social studies instructor told me that it was more meaningful when everything flowed together. I really never thought about that until last year. Of course you're going to learn more if it is meaningful. I didn't learn anything in economics because there wasn't anything very meaningful in it. But in the last two semesters, when I've been taking my methods courses, I've gotten A pluses because it meant something to me. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

Although the language arts methods courses seemed to be the primary source for learning about whole language, all of the informants, except Jane, mentioned a social studies methods course as being instrumental in giving shape to their whole language perspectives. Jane, who did not see much value in her social studies methods course, took social studies at another campus (interview with Jane 12/18/89). Rita's social studies methods course helped her view all subjects as fertile ground for employing her whole language perspective.

> I would have to say that of all of my methods courses, that was the most beneficial one I took. It teaches you how to use social studies and a lot of other things together. My teacher just had a tremendous amount of things to teach us. I have used more from what I learned in that class than any others. Not only in social studies, but also in language and the whole works. (interview with Rita 9/26/89)

Rita's social studies instructor understood the difficulties that many of his students would have when attempting to teach whole language lessons in schools.

> One of the things that I tell the students in the class is that, given the reality of present day schools, if there is any area that they are going to be given more freedom, it's going to be in social studies, not language arts. . . .I tell them when they develop their unit of study [in social studies] that they can integrate a lot of whole language activities and ideas into their unit. (interview with Rita's social studies instructor 10/11/89)

It is hard to believe, however, that the informants whole language perspective resulted from their teacher education program alone.

Personal Dispositions for Reflective Teaching

The informants all seemed to gravitate towards the principles of whole language even though they had not studied it prior to their teacher education program. For example, Paula seemed to believe in the principles of whole language before she had ever heard about it. During her first language arts methods course, Paula tested a perfect forty--indicating total whole language beliefs--on a reading inventory instrument (TORP) (interview with Paula's Language Arts Methods instructor 4/26/89). When asked about this perfect score, Paula explained, "Yes, I guess those were my ideas without my knowing they were my ideas" (interview with Paula 1/17/90). Paula had a lot of prior experience with teaching as she is the mother of a teenage daughter and had tutored students in reading. For example, Paula had learned

about the advantages of children's trade books prior to enrolling in a teacher education program.

> When I started teaching the basal, the stories were pretty boring. . . .So we sort of abandoned the basal, and we went to the library and got books that they liked. . . .And son of a gun, they learned those very same things that they had in the basals. When it came time to pass those stupid little tests, they passed them. By using the trade books, they knew what their blends were and their vocabulary. . . .When we try to teach something that is dry, it takes you forever to get through a paragraph. But if you like it, the book is gone before you know it. (interview with Paula 5/15/89)

Predispositions toward whole language, such as Paula's, seemed to be an important factor behind the informants adopting the whole language philosophy. The importance of the teacher education program, though, can not be discounted. Without the linguistic tools that whole language gave them, the informants would not have been able to begin discussing and articulating just what their tacit philosophy was. The fact that the methods course provided the linguistic tools necessary to talk about their beliefs was summed up nicely by Linda. "I've found out I've been doing it (whole language) all along. Now [after taking reading methods] I can just give it a name" (interview with Linda 3/23/89).

Whole language instruction requires the teacher to be in charge of the curriculum. Decisions about what to teach and how to teach are not left up to the pre-figured curriculum outlined in the teacher's manuals but must be based on knowledge of how students learn and what the students' interests and needs are. Furthermore, traditional

teaching practices, such as lecturing, can not be the sole form of instruction. Cooperative grouping, learning centers, independent study, along with other important ideas become important means for helping students learn. In short, having certain personal reflective dispositions helped enable the informants to teach in the reflective style which whole language required. These dispositions included having a knowledge base for whole language, a commitment to this knowledge base, and talents for acting it out.

Personal Knowledge Base Obviously, in order to teach with a whole language perspective, it is important to have an understanding of what the concepts of whole language are and to have some practical experience in working with these concepts. As discussed in the previous section, the informants were exposed to the ideas of whole language during their pre-service methods courses and had opportunities to see these concepts work in their field experiences. Each of the informants was able to articulate a rather insightful definition of whole language prior to doing their student teaching. For example, Rita discussed some of the concepts of whole language prior to doing her student teaching.

> Rita: The philosophy of the basal is everything happens in steps. You learn your ABC's, and then you put your A's and B's together to find a word. Then words go to sentences and then sentences to paragraphs. With whole language you experience language as a whole. You're exposed to a lot of written text before you came to school, so you are just naturally used to it. So when you come to school, you can be taken right into

> predictable books. . . .In a whole approach you don't say this is a T, this is an A, this is a C, and this is CAT. You say this is CAT because that is a CAT in the picture. It makes more sense to the reader that way.
> Researcher: In what way does it make more sense?
> Rita: When you think back to when you were five years old, did you ever hold a pencil in your hand?
> Researcher: Yes.
> Rita: You probably scribbled and tried to copy your mother's cursive. Kids are used to all that, but when we get them in school, we try to break them down. We say put all that behind you. Don't ever use that experience. Whole language encourages kids to use their past experiences.
> Researcher: How about the teacher's role?
> Rita: It requires a lot more work for the teachers naturally. You have to go and do your own study [of what you want to teach]. It means working with students individually. But this is more valuable for the students. . . .You can't really evaluate in the traditional sense. It is hard to use an ABC approach, so I'm doing some research right now on what are some alternatives. . . .I want to have my own little reading corner with tons of books. I've already started collecting books since my freshman year. (interview of Rita 3/23/89)

By having an understanding of what whole language is, the informants could readily recognize those kinds of teaching practices that were dissonant with a whole language philosophy. This underlying foundation enabled them to recognize opportunities where they could employ their whole language perspective. Then they could concentrated on how to go about implementing it.

Linda's work with the learning centers in her second grade illustrates these points. Linda's cooperating teacher used over a dozen learning centers where students would spend ten minutes and practice one of their skills, such as using their weekly spelling words (observation of Linda 8/29/89). Linda, however, recognized that the learning centers were an excellent opportunity to teach subject

matter, and in the process, students would use a lot of reading and writing.

> I told her [cooperating teacher] she could really coordinate a lot of things with her learning centers. For example, she wanted to do an animal a week, so I told her I'd do a science learning center to go with that. I told her we could do a song, making it into a writing experience, and have word strips that go with that. (interview with Linda 8/22/89)

During the course of her student teaching, Linda implemented several of her own learning centers. She had students doing such activities as writing creative stories on turtles (observation of Linda 8/29/89), writing reports on turtles (interview with Linda 8/30/89), making turtles out of playdough (observation of Linda 8/29/89), and singing a turtle song (observation of Linda 9/7/89).

Linda successfully altered the learning centers away from the skill-based approach of her cooperating teacher and made them more resonant with her whole language perspective. Her knowledge of what whole language is and how she could go about implementing it allowed her to integrated existing strategies with her own.

Commitment Without question, it took a strong desire on the part of the informants to put into practice their whole language perspective. The informants found that planning whole language activities was time-consuming. For Carol, who worked part time twenty-nine hours per week, grading papers and planning lessons took every waking hour.

> I come home after work and do all of my grading. I have Friday and Wednesday off of work, so I spend those days planning. I spend all weekend writing lesson

> plans when I am not working. (interview with Carol 9/14/89)

Carol found it also took a great deal of energy during the school hours to implement her whole language activities. Carol seemed constantly on the go when teaching reading, as the following observation notes indicate.

> Carol announced that those who had finished reading up to page 121 in The Wish Giver would participate in a discussion. Those not finished would stay in their seats and finish. Several students were reading trade books that they had gotten from the library. Carol had the independent group outside in the hall working on a ditto that she had created while the inside group discussed the story. After finishing the discussion, Carol gave those reading the Wish Giver an assignment of pretending they were one of the characters in the story and writing a letter to another character in the story. Then Carol showed the students the different parts of a friendly letter--greeting, body, closing. After giving the assignment, Carol notices David is not doing his assignment. Carol sits with him and they take turns reading the story. Carol notices some commotion out in the hall and goes to investigate. Those students doing independent reading are talking among themselves and getting very little done on the dittoed sheet she assigned them. Carol spreads the students out in the hall and tells them to get busy. When Carol came back in the room, Sam asks her how to spell a certain word. Carol goes to the dictionary and shows him how to look it up. . . .(observation notes of Carol teaching reading 10/16/89)

Carol admitted that it was very difficult managing the students during reading, particularly, when she was working with students and other students were finishing up and in need of something else to do (interview with Carol 10/16/89). Yet, Carol continued to teach reading this way because of her firm commitment that her ideas "would be good for the kids" and the positive feedback she was getting that her students were benefiting from her methods of instruction (interview with Carol 11/8/89).

Talent Being a reflective teacher requires more than just a commitment to hard work; it also requires a lot of skill. Talent for reflection, instructional delivery, student management, and negotiation were all factors that helped enable the informants to manifest their whole language perspective.

Obviously, an important ingredient in being a reflective teacher is the ability to reflect on one's own teaching practices. According to Dewey (1938), "To reflect is to look back over what has been done so as to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock for intelligent dealings with further experiences" (p. 87). When the informants were able to stop and think about their previous teaching actions and extract from these actions those things that went well and those things that needed changing, they found their teaching to be more successful. Rita, for example, who used reflection to help her prepare for her next day of teaching, discussed her natural inclination to reflect.

> What I found myself doing is, first, going through the day and then coming home and thinking about all the things that happened. I try to think what should I have done in that circumstance? How could I have prevented this?--that kind of thing. It's usually a half hour to an hour after I come home that I do that, and then I am ready to start getting ready for the next day. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

Rita taught a lesson one afternoon that dealt with writing paragraphs. The intent of the lesson was to show students how to write topic sentences and then fill in the rest of their paragraphs with sentences that added specific

details. To help illustrate this concept, Rita used a barnyard painting. She explained that authors are like painters in that they pick a subject (barnyard scene) and then add details that complement the scene (chickens, cows, etc.). The lesson, however, did not go well because of student misbehavior. Rita explained:

> I got so frustrated with them to the point I had to yell at them, to tell them to shut up, and I hate to do that. What I wanted to do at that point was to walk over to my desk and sit down and give them an assignment and let them do it themselves. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

However, after reflecting that evening on what happened, Rita came to the conclusion that the lesson itself was not the problem.

> It was the last period of the day. It was snowing, and they were ready to go home and get the sleds out and stuff. I was just really frustrated at the end of the day. I'll probably do it in the morning, and maybe it'll go better. (interview with Rita 10/19/89).

Through the process of reflection, Rita was able to understand that the problem was not necessarily the lesson but the circumstances that surrounded the lesson. Without the tool of reflection, Rita might have given up on a lesson that under more favorable conditions would have yielded better results.

Another important talent that helped enable the informants to manifest their perspectives was the ability to manage students. Paula, for example, admitted that because she started off "mean" and "expected students to be absolutely good," she did not have problems with students misbehaving (interview with Paula 1/17/90). As a result,

her lessons were not constrained by student misbehavior. For example, Paula had her sixth graders make topographical maps out of playdough. Although there was talking among students during the time they were shaping their maps, there were no signs of student misbehavior (observation of Paula 11/23/89). Without the additional burden of keeping students on task and worrying that the lesson would be interrupted by students acting up, Paula could concentrate her efforts on helping students learn about making topographical maps.

Still another important talent that helped enable the informants was their ability to deliver instruction. Skill in such areas as leading discussions and reading aloud were important assets. Linda, for example, was able to keep her thirty-one second graders spellbound when reading aloud to them. During one story she read to students entitled The Aminal, students listened intently as Linda acted out the story by changing the inflection of her voice and using facial expressions (observation of Linda 8/29/89). Carol's skill in leading discussions was evident one day when students discussed the story, The Book of Three. Early in the session, students had little to say about the topic they were discussing. Carol then used the technique, "say something," in which students read a paragraph from the story and say something that the paragraph reminds them of. The technique worked. Students opened up and had a lot to say about the story (observation of Carol 9/18/89).

Finally, a talent for negotiation was important in helping the informants gain more curricular freedom. Paula's cooperating teacher told her prior to her student teaching that she was against whole language. Therefore, Paula explained that from then on she would call her whole language activities "enrichment" instead of using "whole language" (interview with Paula 8/9/89). Carol was able to gain a lot of curricular freedom during her student teaching. Her ability to negotiate with her cooperating teachers was one of the reasons why. When Carol foresaw apparent constraints early in her student teaching, she hoped for some compromises (interview with Carol 9/5/89). One way she negotiated compromises was by always checking her learning activities with her cooperating teacher: "He [cooperating teacher] might not know that I'm trying to integrate things together, but he does know what I'm doing" (observation of Carol 9/14/89). For example, when teaching a unit on animal classification, Carol wanted to have students dissect a fish. Her cooperating teacher, on the other hand, had scheduled an experiment unrelated to animal classification. Carol approached her cooperating teacher, explained what she wanted to do and why she wanted to do it (observation of Carol 9/26/89). As a result of informing her cooperating teacher of her actions and gaining his approval first, she was able to build trust which allowed her to manifest many of her curricular ideas.

Clearly, personal dispositions for reflective teaching were important enabling factors for the informants. Without at least some predispositions towards the philosophy of whole language, along with having a personal knowledge base, a commitment, and talent for reflective teaching, it is doubtful that much, if any, of the informants' whole language perspectives could have been manifested in their placement sites.

Support from Mentoring Relationships

Research, such as that conducted in this study, can be an enabling factor as well; that is, the researcher can establish a mentoring relationship with the beginning teacher which provides an important means of support as well as a means for reflection. Because of the close relationship between the researcher and the key informants, it was the key informants who seemed to prosper most from this mentoring relationship. Karen, for example, talked about the benefits she received from the informant/researcher relationship.

> I really do appreciate having you [this researcher] to talk to. Because my university supervisor hasn't been there, and she has never been a classroom teacher. I don't feel like I had her to talk to. I feel like I'm using you more than you're using me for your study. (interview with Karen 9/25/89)

McCall's research (1987), which looked at seven women who were struggling to manifest their "progressive" perspectives of teaching during their student teaching, also found her informants benefited from the research process:

> The research process itself can foster the empowerment of student teachers by encouraging them to reflect on their teaching, by showing an interest in those aspects of their teaching considered empowered, and by supporting their efforts to become empowered rather than "deskilled" teachers. (p. 244)

Much has been written about beginning teachers benefiting from a mentoring relationship (e.g., Galvez-Hjornevick, 1986; Bova & Phillips, 1984; Huffman & Leak, 1986). The role of the mentor has been characterized as that of being a coach (Schon, 1983; Bird, 1985) and that of being a friend (Fagan and Walter, 1982). However, Stroble and Cooper (1988) point out:

> When the mentor must not only coach the beginner--encouraging, advising, befriending--but also referee the beginner--evaluating, appraising, judging--the most beneficial aspects of a mentor-novice relationship are strained. (p. 233)

One of the biggest reasons why the research process fostered a mentoring relationship was because of the non-judgemental stance of the researcher. It was the objective of this researcher to adopt Spradley's (1979) notion of treating the participants in this study as informants and not subjects. Spradley states:

> Ethnographers adopt a particular stance toward people with whom they work. By word and by action, in subtle ways and direct statements, they say, "I want to understand the world from your point of view. I want to know what you know in the way you know it. I want to understand the meaning of your experience, to walk in your shoes, to feel things as you feel them, to explain things as you explain them. Will you become my teacher and help me understand?" (p. 34)

Additionally, the researcher was knowledgeable about the philosophy of whole language and had a fair understanding of the difficulties involved in student teaching. The

informants seemed to enjoy talking about their experience to a sympathetic listener.

> When I could talk to you [this researcher] about the reading groups, and you would say, "Yes, that is what you had said before." When you reminded me of things that I said before, that made me feel good that I said I would do these things, and I was actually able to do them. Some of the things I thought might work in theory did work--that really helped a lot. It really helped talking to you about any problems I had and venting my frustrations. I don't think it would have been enjoyable, or the same, if you were not there. (interview with Carol 11/8/89)

Besides the informant/researcher relationship enabling the informants by offering support, it also offered a means for reflection.

> Jane: This [the research] has been a great experience because it has helped me clarify what is going on in my mind. When you [this researcher] talked, I would remember things that happened, and it helped me get a clear image in my mind what was going on and how I really felt. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

> Linda: I'm really glad I signed up to have you [researcher] come in and work with me. It's been really good to be questioned, to be asked, "Why in the world did you do that?" We need to be evaluated in order to be able to change and grow, or whatever. (interview with Linda 10/23/89)

The process of asking questions can lead individuals to reflect. This is not to say, however, that questions can automatically illicit reflection. Often times, questions can lead the respondent to take on defensive behavior which is inimical to reflection. But if the inquirer can establish what Spradley (1979) calls "a friendly conversation" with the respondent, then an atmosphere of trust can be established. Once trust is established,

researchers can ask questions which can be avenues for reflection.

Although it was not the intention of this researcher to act as a mentor for the key informants, it was a positive result. This mentoring relationship helped the key informants by supporting their whole language perspective and helping them to reflect on their teaching practices.

Summary

Chapter Five has outlined the different strategies and options employed by the informants as they made their way through their student teaching. All of them continued to verbally support their original beliefs about whole language, even though, in many instances they were forced to conform to the existing curriculum in their classroom environments. When forced to conform, the informants used four different strategies (critical compliance, accommodative resistance, resistant alteration, and transformative action) which enabled them to both maintain their perspective and, in some cases, alter existing teacher practices, replacing them with their whole language teaching strategies. Two of the informants were able to employ the options of "corresponding compliance" and "encouraged curricular action" because of the curricular freedom they had at their placement sites. In addition to the strategies and options they employed, the informants were enabled by favorable pupil responses, institutional support, their teacher education programs, personal dispositions for

reflective teaching, and support from a mentoring relationship.

The final chapter includes conclusions for this research and provides recommendations for the informants' teacher preparation program as well as those teacher preparation programs wishing to foster the kind of reflective teaching practices that whole language philosophy promotes.

RESPONSES

"What a good chapter. Your writing style makes what you write interesting as well as enjoyable to read. The information flows well. I would check your use of the word curriculum. Although I do try to work with what the children want to learn, as my cooperating teacher use [sic] to say, "It isn't fair if we let them take the state competency tests without giving them the information that will be on the test." Most principals would be upset to find that a teacher did not teach what was required for that grade, and the students would be behind going into the following grade. Flexibility comes with how you teacher it." (personal correspondence with Jane 7/7/90)

"Very interesting! I couldn't put this down. I think that you have pinpointed many of the conflicts facing student teachers.

The kind of information in chapter five is what future teachers would like to see before the student teaching experience." (personal correspondence with Paula 7/2/90)

"Chapter five left the reader with a better feeling than chapter four. It was more positive, and very insightful. I learned a great deal from reading your work in this chapter. And it is true that having a mentor to speak to is helpful and a large support.

Thank you for letting me be a part of your study. A happy note to close your research. I have gotten a fifth grade teaching job, and am <u>really</u> looking forward to finally having my own classroom." (personal correspondence with Rita 7/6/90)

"Research used in your project <u>ought</u> to be required reading for preservice teachers. It covers many areas of anxiety and could <u>really</u> benefit many." (personal correspondence with Linda 7/7/90)

"It is interesting reading about strategies such as critical compliance, accommodative resistance, etc. We [the informants] were using all these strategies without even realizing it. I just acted on instincts and did whatever came naturally. Almost everything I did just felt like second nature.

Believe me it would be much easier to stick to basic worksheet plans, but if you're a good teacher and care about the kids and learning I think you automatically just want to do more.

I think you can learn the most by sharing with other teachers, and when other teacher's listen to you, it's the highest form of flattery.

I can't believe my cooperating teacher (Dick) said all those good things about me; he was so quiet about it. I

knew he thought I could teach okay, but he has had a lot of student teachers. Boy, that is an ego booster.

I wonder if I affected my cooperating teachers any to move towards a more whole language perspective?!

The research you did instills in me even further the idea that whole language works. (personal correspondence with Carol 7/10/90)

"My initial reaction to the chapter: disappointment in my experience. Even now as I interview [for a teaching position] I speak of my elementary student teaching experience as what not to do. Yes, I plan on sticking to my whole language beliefs but doing it more on my terms. The chapter made me feel as if I cheated myself in not at least speaking out some of my criticisms of my cooperating teacher's classroom.

I also remember how important it was to me to impress her so that I receive a good evaluation. Now I wonder what is more important: my evaluation or sticking up for my professional beliefs.

Being reflective is important. Reading over these chapters has been very reflective for me." (personal correspondence with Karen 7/10/90)

CHAPTER SIX

MAKING WHOLE LANGUAGE WHOLE: WHAT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS CAN DO

Within the ever growing debate on teacher education reform, there exist numerous educators who are calling for future teachers to be reflective (e.g., Smyth, 1989; Tom, 1985; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). One voice (Zeichner and Liston, 1987) in this reflective discourse suggest that

> . . .unless we can begin to prepare teachers who are willing to assume more central roles in shaping the direction of their own work and school environments, the kinds of changes which may be on the horizon with regard to the occupation of teaching will continue to maintain the familiar pattern of "change but no change." The preparation of reflective student teachers is a necessary first step for those of us who work in university programs of teacher education. (p. 45)

Despite such calls, it seems few teacher education programs exist which attempt to foster the kind of reflection that Zeichner and Liston are advocating. Howey and Zimpher's (1989) study of teacher preparation programs in the United States found most prospective teachers had adopted a technocratic approach to teaching.

> There seemed to be, almost without exception, a relatively unthinkable acceptance of current school policy and practice. Examples of the moral and ethical consequences of teaching were rarely volunteered or well-responded to when we probed. The dominant conception of teaching these prospective teachers embraced was technical in nature. (p. 264)

Liston and Zeichner themselves (1987) are "pessimistic that fundamental and meaningful changes can be brought about" in teacher education programs given the current institutional and political environment found in the United States (p.

132). Clearly, if the need for reflective teachers is important, we need teacher education programs that can begin to foster the kind of reflective thought called for by educators such as Zeichner and Liston (1987).

Three important sets of conclusions drawn from this study can contribute to the discourse which seeks to promote reflective teaching in future teachers. The first conclusion is that the basic tenants of whole language philosophy are in line with those tenants of reflective pedagogy that many educators are attempting to promote (e.g., Smyth, 1989; Tom, 1985; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). As Chapter Three points out, the key informants viewed technocratic teaching practices as problematic. They found potential in using their whole language perspectives in all subject areas, not just language arts, and attempted to make reading and writing more meaningful events for their students. Moreover, they saw knowledge as socially constructed and stressed process over product. They viewed the teacher as the one to make curricular decisions and believed that those decisions were best made through observing the interests and needs of their pupils. Finally, they viewed pupils as active agents in the learning process and offered pupils choices in what they learned.

Secondly, it can be concluded that the informants' teacher education program was responsible for moving them towards their whole language perspectives. All of the informants pointed to their methods courses when discussing

the underpinnings for their whole language perspectives. As has been mentioned earlier, much existing research on the socialization of teachers indicates that future teachers give up the ideals learned at the university for the conservative teaching practices they find in their placement sites. However, the future teachers in this study, at least during their student teaching phase, maintained their whole language beliefs despite the many constraining factors they encountered in their teaching environments.

The first two sets of conclusions offer teacher educators evidence that the philosophy of whole language can serve as a means for helping future teachers become more reflective about their teaching practices. However, a third conclusion drawn from this study is that the informants' teacher education program, although instrumental in helping them towards the reflective teaching practices of whole language, was deficient in many areas. If the informants' teacher education programs are intent on helping future teachers become reflective, it is necessary to implement changes. Judging from the abundance of literature that points out similar weaknesses in teacher education programs throughout the United States (e.g., Zeichner, 1983; Tom, 1985; Gore, 1987; Howey & Zimpher 1989), it can be concluded that the following recommendations can also help inform other teacher education programs committed to helping future teachers become more reflective.

Recommendations

First, in order to make whole language whole, the philosophy of whole language must incorporate social/political values into its educational philosophy. Much has been written concerning the importance of teacher education in this country to begin helping future teachers become socially and politically minded. Bullough (1989), for example, has pointed out that teacher educators' neglect of social/political aims could mean that "one might be reflective about a problem and yet embrace solutions that are ethically irresponsible given the values of a society committed to realizing democracy" (p. 16). Without considering the ethical and moral implications of their actions, there is a danger that novice teachers might resort to teaching practices such as those noted by Buchmann and Schwille (1983):

> After their first experiences "on the other side of the desk" in student teaching, many future teachers act as if maintaining an orderly and busy classroom amounts to good teaching. Their conception of their work gets determined by what they first succeed in. What typically helps teachers survive in their beginning years (i.e., the activation of models of teaching acquired in the lengthy course of their own schooling) may be irrelevant for purposes of getting better at teaching. (p. 37)

Despite such warnings, the informants' teacher education program focused little attention on social/political values. There were few instances when the informants pointed to democratic ideals as reasons for the kind of teaching practices they implemented. Nor were their criticisms of school practices concerned with social/political factors

(i.e., ability grouping may contribute to the stratification of social classes in American society); instead, the informants criticisms focused on psychological factors (i.e., pupils do not learn that way, see pp. 57-58). Of the informants, only Jane mentioned purposes other than psychological for using her whole language teaching strategies. She explained her reasons for using cooperative grouping as follows:

> I see from my observation how dependent kids are on their teachers and how mean the kids are to each other, so that is why I believe in it. A lot of kids go through the phase of not working together, and I want them to work together as a community. I want them to know what community is and understand that they are not the beginning and ending of this world, but they are a part of this world. (interview with Jane 12/18/89)

Jane's social/political perspective, though, was not evident prior to her student teaching experience. This perspective was gained from her student teaching experience, and it came primarily from the interactions she had with her cooperating teacher and her students (interview with Jane 12/18/89). For Jane, as well as the other informants, there seemed to be far too little emphasis in her pre-service course work on helping her to form a social/political value stance.

Considering the emphasis placed on reflective teaching within a whole language philosophy, why would these informants' language arts courses neglect a social/political emphasis? One reasons for this neglect can be traced to the disregard for a social/political perspective in much of the literature pertaining to whole language and reflective teaching. According to Shannon (1989), writers in the field

of whole language such as Ken Goodman (1986), Donald Graves (1983) and Frank Smith (1986) are interested in creating democratic social arrangements in their classrooms, but "this interest is based on psychological rather than political beliefs" (p. 629). Likewise, a great deal of the literature on reflective teaching has disregarded a social/political perspective. Tom (1985) points out that much of the current discourse on teaching future teachers to be reflective (e.g., Cruickshank and Applegate, 1981; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Ellner, 1977) has narrowed the scope of the problematic to the technical aspects of the teaching-learning process. This type of reflective teaching, according to Gore (1987), "does not actively encourage students to question existing practices, to consider why something is taught or the probable long-term effects of a particular classroom action or decision" (p. 36).

It should be pointed out that scholarship does exist in both whole language (e.g., Harste and Short, 1988; Shannon, 1989) and reflective teaching (e.g., Bullough, 1989; Zeichner & Liston, 1987; Tom, 1985) which explicitly links social/political values to teaching actions. What is needed, it seems, is for teacher education programs, such as the informants', to make use of or integrate this literature into their courses. As Shannon (1989) points out, whole language philosophy can prosper from attaching itself to democratic ideals.

> By adding a political and sociological dimension to our psychological attraction to whole language approaches,

> we can confront the reality of literacy lessons to show both what is offered and what is denied by our present practices and what literacy lessons might become for all participants. Political and sociological imagination can help us recognize the complex contexts in which we work, the present and potential meanings of that work, and some methods through which we might realize these potentials. Only after we open our classroom doors in order to look beyond the student/teacher dyad to examine the social and political relations of our work and literacy will we really be prepared to engage in the struggle for control of literacy lessons. (p. 632-633)

Furthermore, a social/political dimension gives whole language educators a purpose for helping pupils become more literate. Instead of the traditional instructional practices which seek to help students "master" the tools of reading, whole language education could begin to help individuals become empowered through literacy. Harste and Short (1988) note the value of whole language's potential for empowerment.

> The empowering nature of language and literacy is why we and several others are such proponents of whole language. . . .In classroom environments based on what we currently know we have repeatedly seen children who had been silenced gain a voice. Given the nature of our society, we believe it is important that our conceptions of literacy begin with the notion of voice and the importance of hearing everyone's's voice. In supposedly democratic societies we especially believe it is important to hear voices which have been previously silenced. (p. 4)

To place the blame solely on the language arts courses for not emphasizing a social/political value stance is letting all the other courses and field experiences in the informants' teacher education program get by without criticism. Perhaps the biggest reason for the informants not developing a social/political consciousness during their

program is the lack of a collective effort found among the informants' course work, field experience, and supervision. The second recommendation for making whole language whole, therefore, is to establish a collective effort such as Howey and Zimpher (1989) describe:

> Programs have one or more frameworks grounded in theory and research as well as practice; frameworks that explicate, justify, and build consensus around such fundamental conceptions as the role of the teacher, the nature of teaching and learning, and the mission of schools in this democracy. These frameworks guide not only the nature of curriculum as manifested in individual courses but, as well, questions of scope; developmental sequence; integration of discrete disciplines; and the relationships of pedagogical knowledge to learning how to teach in various laboratory, clinical, and school settings. Programs embedded in such frameworks clearly establish priorities in terms of key dispositional attitudes and behaviors enabled and monitored in repeated structured experiences. (p. 242)

The informants were critical of some of their pre-service course work which did not help them further extend their whole language perspectives. For example, recall Carol's disappointment when her math methods course failed to give her insight into teaching math in a whole language way (See p. 36). Moreover, there was no mention of the informants' university supervisor helping them to become more reflective about their teaching practices. In fact, the informants' university supervisors were not very knowledgeable about whole language. For example, Linda's university supervisor explained her lack of knowledge about this philosophy in this way:

> Some did talk about the whole language program. I am not really up to speed on that particular concept. I am not sure what it is or what it is if I say it, but

> it was mentioned to me. (interview with Linda's university supervisor 1/16/90)

Obviously, a collective effort can not be obtained if the different professionals on the teacher education team are unaware of what others are attempting to do. Barnes (1987) warns teacher educators of the danger of not providing a collective effort.

> If all program courses, practices, and management strategies used in the program do not create and support a consistent image of what the philosophy of the program means in day-to-day classroom life, the program will not contribute to the schema development that is needed. (p. 15)

Evidence supporting the importance of a collective effort surfaced when the informants talked about the value they received from their social studies course (See pp. 169-170). Carol, for example, felt her social studies instructor's philosophy was whole language (interview with Carol 9/26/89). This social studies course not only helped strengthen Carol's conviction in whole language principles but also gave her practical experiences of developing an original unit of study and then teaching it--necessary tools for implementing a whole language perspective. Only Jane, who took her social studies course off campus, did not benefit from a social studies course such as Carol's. It is significant to note that Jane admittedly struggled with the planning and delivery of a science unit because she had no prior experience at planning and delivering a unit of study (interview with Jane 10/6/89).

Without question, the teacher preparation program of the informants needs more of the collective effort that was demonstrated between the social studies methods course and the language arts methods courses. A good starting point for teacher educators wishing to build a coherent program is to sit down and conceptualize the qualities of a good beginning teacher (Bullough, 1989; Howey & Zimpher 1989). By developing a degree of consensus (i.e., a good beginning teacher is reflective on how they teach, what they teach, and why they teach in certain ways) then a more collective effort can be undertaken which can lead to a stronger schema development in beginning teachers such as Barnes (1987) suggests.

If teacher education programs are going to strive towards developing a collective effort that seeks to foster the kind of reflective teaching that educators such as Zeichner and Liston (1987) advocate, then a third set of recommendations needs to be put into place: the clinical component of these programs has to make fundamental changes. First, the programs must adopt Dewey's (1904) notion of viewing the field experience as a laboratory in which future teachers become students of teaching by pursing personal inquiry and reflecting upon their teaching practices rather than seeking to gain some sort of immediate proficiency. If this perspective is to take hold, both university supervisors and cooperating teachers will have to offer support and assistance to student teachers.

One way they can be supportive is to follow the example of Jane and Rita's cooperating teachers: encourage their student teachers to develop and implement an original unit of study. In addition to encouraging Rita to develop a unit of study, Rita's cooperating teacher had Rita share the intent of her lesson plans with her. Rita found this helpful.

> My cooperating teacher asks to see them [lesson plans], so she can go through and add things she thinks would work or wouldn't work. That's been real helpful because she can go through and say, "In the past this hasn't worked for me, and I think it would be better if you did this." She makes a lot of helpful suggestions, things from just experience that she has learned. (interview with Rita 10/19/89)

In addition to having student teachers sharing the intent of their lessons, student teacher and cooperating teacher (and/or university supervisor) should sit down after the lesson and reflect on how the intent of the lesson was played out in practice. By examining the intent of lessons with how those intentions are played out in practice, future teachers can begin to understand the interconnected relationship between theory and practice and how each can inform the other. The purpose of this strategy is to help future teachers be thoughtful about their instructional techniques, the content being used, and the moral and ethical implications of their teaching practices. It is not a way to aid student teachers in gaining immediate proficiency.

University supervisors using techniques such as the above could offer the student teacher a mentoring

relationship similar to the informant/researcher relationship developed in this study. By establishing a mentoring relationship, university supervisors could offer student teachers much needed support as well as provide a means for reflection. In order for this to happen, however, many of the characteristics of the relationship exhibited between the informants and their university supervisor (i.e., university supervisor only visiting once every two weeks and university supervisor's limited knowledge about whole language) will have to be changed. First of all, university supervisors will have to spend considerably more time--meeting at least once a week--developing the intimate relationship necessary for the student teachers to gain their trust so as to negate the defensive behavior that typically characterizes a supervisor/subordinate relationship. Additionally, university supervisors will have to be knowledgeable about the principles of whole language and committed to helping the student teacher foster a whole language perspective. Finally, university supervisors must help student teachers begin reflecting on their teaching practices through such means as questioning their motives and probing the implications of what these motives will yield.

One way to make sure that the university supervisors as well as the cooperating teachers are knowledgeable and committed to the ideals of whole language is to make the cooperating teachers and university supervisors more

intimately connected with the rest of the teacher education program. A way to accomplish this task is to use Howey and Zimpher's (1989) idea of having faculty members who teach the pre-service methods courses spend time in the schools assisting university supervisors and cooperating teachers:

> It makes little sense for people who see themselves as expert in teaching methodology not to be intimately involved from time to time in the "real world" of schools and to be committed to a stronger partnership and better communication that typically exists between them and their colleagues in K-12 schools. An obvious strategy is to prepare jointly teacher leaders released partially from their teaching to assume broader roles in the clinical and student teaching or internship phases of teacher preparation. (p. 253)

Similarly, university supervisors and cooperating teachers should spend time at the university assisting in the teaching of methods courses. By intimately connecting the university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and methods instructors, a more coherent program could begin to take shape.

Still another change needed to make whole language more whole is to allow student teachers to spend more time preparing lessons and reflecting on their teaching practices and less time per week in their placement sites. As can be recalled (See pp. 113-116), time limitation was one of the biggest constraints the informants confronted. Each of the informants was required to assume full teaching responsibility during at least four weeks of her student teaching experience. Instead of this kind of intensive experience, informants could have profitted by spending part of their time outside classrooms doing such things as

planning their lessons, observing other teachers teach, going to workshops, and discussing with others (university supervisors, cooperating teachers, methods instructors, other teachers, and other student teachers) their teaching practices.

Freeing time for the student teachers, however, would not necessarily help future teachers become more reflective if university supervisors and cooperating teachers do not have more time in which to lend their support and assistance. The informants' university supervisors did not have adequate time to help the informants reflect on their teaching practices. Linda's university supervisor admitted that with just four visits--the amount required by the teacher education program--her impact was minimal (interview with Linda's university supervisor 1/16/90). University supervisors as well as cooperating teachers can support and assist future teachers as they struggle in areas such as managing students, preparing lessons, delivering instruction, and deliberating on the moral and ethical consequences of their teaching practices only if they have time to do so.

Finally, material resources have to be made available for the informants. If future teachers are going to be asked to reflect on their teaching practices, to plan original units of study, and to engage in personal inquiry concerning such topics as the teaching/learning process, then materials have to be made available for them to use. A

good example illustrating the need for material resources was the inadequate supply of children's trade books that Carol could find for her lower level reading group. If future teachers are going to learn in their methods courses that using sets of children's literature books is a useful alternative to the commercially produced basal texts typically found in classrooms, they must have access to sets of trade books when they begin to plan their lessons. Moreover, future teachers could benefit from information such as classroom management strategies when the need arose. University supervisors and cooperating teachers could suggest or assign readings on topics from which the student teachers could benefit. Once again, however, in order for distribution of information such as this, resource materials have to be made available.

The concluding set of suggestions deals with the content provided in the teacher education programs and the type of instruction teacher educators model for future teachers. Bullough (1987) warns teacher educators about the importance of giving beginning teachers important "survival" skills.

> If novice teachers do not learn how to manage students and how to design and present appropriate and stimulating lessons, the role and responsibilities of teacher, as institutionalized, will break them. Failure in this area results in arrested development; the beginning teacher may forever be condemned to purgatory that is the survival stage of teaching. (p. 231)

Many of the informants struggled with managing students, planning lessons, and delivering instruction (See pp. 116-

122). Jane, for example, who had no experience planning and delivering large group instruction prior to her student teaching, floundered in her first attempts at doing so. Because of her inexperience, she relied heavily on her teacher's manual--even though she admitted she did not like to use the teacher's manual and her cooperating teacher encouraged her to plan and implement her own original unit of study (See pp. 99-100). It is reasonable to assume that if Jane had been given some experience at planning and delivering large group instruction prior to doing her student teaching, she would have taught her science unit much differently. Most of the informants struggled with classroom management, particularly when teaching students in small groups. Although each of the informants' whole language perspectives informed them of the importance of cooperative groups, no where in their pre-service program did they receive training in how to manage a room full of students engaged in cooperative groups. Clearly, teacher education programs if they are to help future teachers become more reflective about their teaching practices, must help future teachers with the important survival skills of managing students, planning lessons, and delivering instruction.

Another deficiency in the content of the informants' teacher education program was the lack of information pertaining to the kinds of constraining factors that exist in schools. Liston and Zeichner (1987) recognize the

importance of helping future teachers understand what they will be up against when they enter public school buildings.

> Teacher education programs should begin to examine how the conditions of schooling and teachers' work inhibit prospective teachers' chosen goals. As a novice teacher develops beliefs about school issues such as ability grouping, cooperative social relations in the classroom, discipline and classroom control, or approaches to reading instruction, then it is the role of the teacher educator to help the prospective teacher examine the ways in which the conditions of schooling and teachers' work obstruct or facilitate their goals. (p. 125)

One form of assistance that teacher preparation programs could offer is helping beginning teachers understand the "politics of teaching" (Kohl, 1976). According to Kohl (1976), if beginning teachers who are intent on creating more democratic conditions in schools are to be successful, these "prospective teachers have to know something about the rules, customs, and manners that govern the social system they will be trying to change" (p. 124). By understanding more fully how the school's social system operates, future teachers can begin the task of implementing realistic changes within their schools. Goodman (1988, p.39) notes several important political skills that he believes future teachers who are orientated towards reflective and active forms of pedagogy need to have: 1) how to relate to individuals in authority positions; 2) how to deal with institutional traditions and expected norms; 3) how to propose and initiate changes in ways that do not needlessly alienate other people; 4) how to sustain change once it begins; and 5) how to develop a base of support

among pupils, other school personnel, and community members. In addition to helping future teachers develop a political awareness of the social world of schools in general and political skills necessary for dealing with that social world, teacher education programs can help prospective teachers examine the specific constraints that they meet in their particular placement sites. One way of doing that is through a study of the school culture when doing their student teaching. For example, student teachers could, with the help of their university supervisor, conduct an ongoing study of the many constraints they face in their particular buildings. For instance, it might be determined that a shortage of time makes it impossible for the student teacher to plan original lessons in every subject. Therefore, a strategy in which the student teacher concentrates planning original lessons in only one or two areas instead of all the subject areas could be adopted.

Equally important to the kind of content presented by teacher educators is the way that content is delivered. Howey and Zimpher (1989), after observations of college classrooms, speak to college educators on the importance of their pedagogical practices:

> A major insight which we gained in our several classroom observations was the extent to which students reflected the instructional posture of their professors. That is, if we were in a class in which the professor engaged students in a very active and intellectually challenging type of dialogue, students invariably were able to respond to this and, in fact, build upon and further contribute to understanding the topic at hand. However, if students, and in many instances the very same students, were in a situation

> where they were placed in a relatively passive and noninitiating role, they behaved accordingly. (p. 262)

Of course, if college instructors want to instill a whole language perspective in future teachers, the way they go about teaching it must reflect a whole language philosophy. Rita's, Karen's, and Carol's Language Arts Methods I instructor did just that.

> They actually write their own family stories, and then they publish them. They read professional books and then interact with others. They write their own professional essays. I use that as a basis for them to begin to observe their own feelings that are going through them. I want to create in them a new image of what it is like to be literate in a socially supportive environment. . . .I want them to develop a new image of themselves as readers and writers. I would much prefer to say to them, "Now think about your own experience; how could you get kids to have those experiences in the classroom in a sort of prescribed sort of curriculum that everybody uses?" (interview with Rita's, Karen's and Carol's Language Arts Methods I instructor 4/25/89)

There is little doubt that one of the biggest reasons why the informants were strongly committed to their whole language perspectives was because their language arts courses modeled a whole language philosophy. However, according to Carol, not all of her education methods courses were taught in the same fashion (i.e., socially supportive environments with opportunities for personal inquiry) as her language arts and her social studies courses (interview with Carol 11/8/89). Again, as has been suggested, the importance of a collected effort can not be underestimated.

Finally, it is important that teacher educators within teacher education programs understand that changes within, although important, are not all that is needed. Zeichner

and Liston (1987) explain the need for a comprehensive approach to teacher reform:

> We view teacher education reform as an important part of a more comprehensive reform strategy, one that must also include changes in the preparation and training of school administrators and other support personnel, the quality of working conditions in schools and universities, the occupational structure of teaching, state certification and testing policies, and the unequal economic, political and social realities that characterize our society as a whole. (p. 118)

As many educators have pointed out, the working conditions that exist in American schools must be improved (Goodman, 1988; Shulman, 1983; Howey & Zimpher, 1989). Outside influences such as limited funding for education and state mandated testing have a negative impact on the quality of classroom life. The curriculum within the informants' placement sites was influenced to a large extent by the state competency test. The informants discovered, for example, that accuracy in punctuation was the main focus of the state competency test not the the process approach to writing they aspired to teach. All the informants felt the pressure to alter curriculum in order to help pupils do well on the state competency test. Even Jane's cooperating teacher who resisted the commercially produced textbooks and strongly resented the rationale behind the state competency test was forced into "teaching to the test" (See pp. 137-138).

Limited funding also adversely affected classroom life. The large class sizes of Linda's and Rita's placement sites and the many extra responsibilities that the informants and

their cooperating teachers were expected to fulfill--such as the supervision of lunch, rest rooms, recess, and buses--are all evidence of inadequate funding. In order to effect meaningful changes in classroom life, federal, state, and local governments must begin supplying adequate funding for public education. The schools where the informants were placed were not the only places that were under-financed. Their university's teacher educational program was equally disadvantaged. All of the informants' university supervisors were part-time employees in addition to being full-time graduate students. The informants' university's inadequate funding for supervision is not at all uncommon in other institutions of higher education as many educators have noted (Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986; Zeichner and Liston, 1987; Howey and Zimpher, 1989). If university supervisors are going to contribute to the collective effort in helping future teachers become more reflective, the university must be able to make the necessary financial commitment.

Suggestions for Future Research

Studies such as this one, which look into the socialization of beginning teachers using field-based methodologies, are important. By understanding how beginning teachers learn to teach, teacher education programs can begin to make more appropriate policy decisions. Much in the area of teacher socialization, however, still needs to be researched. First, longitudinal

studies are needed that follow novice teachers through their pre-service courses into their student teaching and beyond. Certainly, the socialization processes of the informants and other beginning teachers is not complete upon finishing their student teaching. Bullough (1987) argues that student teaching is much different than first-year teaching:

> One discovery first-year teachers quickly make is that "real" teaching and student teaching are remarkably different experiences: As student teachers they taught in classrooms where instructional and management routines were already established. They enjoyed the support and attention of a cooperating teacher who was genuinely interested in their success if for no better reason than to make certain they did not foul up the students or the teacher's programs too severely. They had cooperating teachers' units to draw on even if they did not like them. First-year teachers can count on none of this; they quickly discover that in various ways their experience has been inadequate to the tasks facing them. (p. 222)

If Bullough is correct, how will the informants whole language philosophy support them in their first year of teaching? What problems will they encounter? How will they respond to these problems? And, how will their responses relate to their further development as teachers?

Another important set of questions concerns the feasibility of implementing whole language in inner city settings. Karen ran into more constraints in her inner city setting than the other informants did. Are other inner city settings as fraught with constraints as Karen's placement site? How would other individuals who had a whole language perspective respond to an inner city context? For example, could Carol, who was able to manifest a great deal of her

whole language philosophy in her fifth grade, do so in a placement site similar to Karen's?

Future research also needs to examine pupils' reactions to novice teachers as they attempt to implement whole language teaching practices. What do children learn from such teaching? In what ways do they change their attitudes concerning reading and writing? Do pupils begin to look at knowledge differently as a result of their teachers' attempts at supporting personal knowledge?

Finally, more research has to be conducted on other teacher education programs intent on helping future teachers become reflective. What do these specific programs offer in their methods courses, and how is the supervision they offer in the field conducted? Do beginning teachers in these programs run into constraints similar to the ones the informants were up against? Are these programs only successful at helping those individuals who show a predisposition for reflective teaching, or are they successful at helping all future teachers to become reflective? How do individual state policies constrain and/or enable future teachers learning to be reflective? For example, would states such as Virginia, that use a "performance-based" teacher-certification system, add additional constraints to help future teachers become reflective?

If teacher educators are serious about helping future teachers become reflective, the above questions and many

others must be addressed. Once we begin to understand those factors necessary for successfully helping future teachers become reflective, we can begin the important work of setting up effective teacher education programs.

References

Adler, M. (1982). The paedia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Albert, B. (1989, September 8). State board adopts goals for Hoosier schools to attain. The Indianapolis Star, p. 1.

Albert, B. (1989, October 5). Nearly 1 in 5 schools fails to meet state standards. The Indianapolis Star, pp. 1, 12.

Albert, B. (1989, December 15). Officials to vote on awards for school performance. The Indianapolis Star, pp. 1, 16.

Albert, B. (1989, December 19). Schools ponder ways to spend award funds. The Indianapolis Star, pp. 1, 2.

Alexander, L. (1964). The Book of Three. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. The Elementary Journal. 79, 193-223.

Apple, M., & Teitelbaum, K. (1986). Are teachers losing control of their skills and curriculum? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18, 177-184.

Applegate, J. (1986). Undergraduate students' perceptions of field experiences: Toward a framework for study. In J. Raths & L. Katz (eds.), Advances in teacher education, Vol. 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Balian, L. (1972). The aminal. Nashville: Abindon.

Ball, S. (1983). Case study research in education: Some notes and problems. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), The ethnography of schooling. Driffield: Nafferton.

Ball, S. (1985). Participant observation with pupils. In R. Burgess (Ed.), Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods. London: Falmer Press.

Barnes, H. (1987). The conceptual bases for thematic teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 13-17.

Becher, R., & Ade, W. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. Journal of Teacher Education, 33, 24-30.

Becker, H. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 40-53.

Berger, P. & Luchman, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday.

Beyer, L. (1986). The reconstruction of knowledge and educational studies. Journal of Education, 168, 113-135.

Beyer, L., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Teacher education in cultural context: Beyond reproduction. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practices. London: The Falmer Press.

Bird, T. (1985). From teacher to leader: Training and support for mentor teachers, master teachers, and teacher advisors. Unpublished manuscript, The Far West Regional Educational Laboratory, San Francisco.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspectives and methods. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bova, B., & Phillips, R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 16-20.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. (1976). Learning from teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Buchmann, M., & Schwille, J. (1983) Education: The overcoming of experience. American Journal of Education, 92, 30-51.

Bullough, R. (1987). First-Year teaching: A case study. Teachers College Report, 89, 219-237.

Bullough, R. (1989). Teacher education and teacher reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 15-21.

Burgess, R. (1985). Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods. London: Falmer Press.

Brittain, B. (1983). The Wish Giver. New York: Harper & Row.

Conant, J. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Copeland, W. (1980). Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory and Practice, 18, 194-199.

Cornbleth, C. (1987). The persistence of myth in teacher education and teaching. In T. Popkewitz (ed.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice. London: The Falmer Press.

Cruickshank, D. (1985). Models for the preparation of America's teachers. Bloomington, In: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundations

Cruickshank, D., & Applegate, J. (1981). Reflective teaching as a strategy for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 38, 553-554.

De Castell, S., & Luke, A. (1987). Literacy instruction: Technology and technique. American Journal of Education, 95, 413-440.

Deford, D., & Harste, J. (1982). Child language research and curriculum. Language Arts, 59, 590-600.

Densmore, K. (1987). Professionalism proletarianization and teacher work. In T. Popkewitz (Eds.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice. London: The Falmer Press.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. McMurray (Ed.), Third yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1910). How we think. Boston: D.C. Heath.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Chicago: Henry Regnery.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books.

Dikenson, W. (1979). A follow-up study of the attitudes of Central Michigan University graduates of the years 1973-1976 toward the undergraduate teacher education program in which they participated with implications for teacher education program (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 62345A. (University Microfilms No. 80-13724)

Dobbert, M. (1982). Ethnographic research: Theory and application for modern schools and society. New York: Praeger.

Doyle, W. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Eisner, E. (1982). Cognition and curriculum. New York: Longman.

Ellner, C. (1977). The preparation of teaching scholars--A new dimension. California Journal of Teacher Education, 4, 93-104.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, New York: Macmillan.

Fagan, M., & Walter, G. (1982). Mentoring among teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 76, 113-117.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), The third handbook of research on teaching. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Friebus, R. (1977). Agents of socialization involved in student teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 70, 263-268.

Fuller, F. & Brown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), The 74th yearbook of the National Society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gallemore, S. L. (1979). The student teaching experience: Perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 1948A. (University Microfilms No. 79-22407)

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 6-11.

Gehrke, N. (1988). On preserving the essence of mentoring as one form of teacher leadership. Journal of Teacher Education, 39, 43-45.

George, J. (1959). My side of the Mountain. New York: Dutton.

George, J. (1972). Julie of the wolves. New York: Harper & Row.

Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 162, 5-27.

Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 257-293.

Giroux, H. (1984). Rethinking the language of schooling. Language Arts, 61, 33-40.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 213-238.

Gibson, A. (1979). A follow-up study of the elementary education graduates of Troy State University from 1975-1977 (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University), Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 3239A. (University Micro films No. 79-2759)

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, J. & Lecompte, M. (1981). Ethnographic research and problem of data reduction. Anthropology and Education, 12, 51-70.

Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.

Good, T., Grouws, D. (1977). Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth grade mathematics. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 49-54.

Good, T., & Grouws, D. (1981). Experimental research in secondary classrooms: Working with teachers. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.

Goodlad, John (1982). Lets get on with reconstruction. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 19-20.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodman, J. (1985). Field-based experience: A study of social control and student teachers' response to institutional constraints. Journal of Education for Teachers, 11, 26-49.

Goodman, J. (1987). Factors in becoming a proactive elementary school teacher: A preliminary study of selected novices. Journal of Education for Teaching, 13, 207-229.

Goodman, J. (1988). The political tactics and teaching strategies of reflective, active preservice teachers. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 23-41.

Goodman, K. (1979). The know-more and the know-nothing movements in reading: A personal response. Language Arts 56, 657-663.

Goodman, K. (1986). Basal readers: A Call for Action. Language Arts, 63, 358-363.

Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K., Smith, E., Meredith, R., & Goodman, Y. (1986). Language and thinking in School: A whole-language curriculum. New York: Owens.

Gore, J. (1987). Reflecting on reflective teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 33-39.

Grant, C. (1984). Preparing for reflective teaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Graves, D. (1983). Writing: Students and teachers at work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Greene, M. (1978). The matter of mystification: Teacher education in unquiet times. In M. Greene (Ed.), Landscapes of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, G. (1986). Issues in student teaching: A review. In J. Raths & L. Katz (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Vol 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughues, R., O'Neal, S., Edwards, S., & Defino, M. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 29, 75-92.

Halliday, M., K. (1975). Learning how to mean. London: Edward Arnold.

Hammersley, M. (1986). Controversies in classroom research classroom research. Milton: Open University Press.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. New York: Tavistock.

Harste, J., & Short, K. (1988). What educational difference does your theory of language make? Paper presented at the International World Congress, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 397)

Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). Language stories and literacy lessons. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hodges, C. (1982). Implementing methods: If you can't blame the cooperating teacher, who can you blame? Journal of Teacher Education, 33, 25-29.

Holdaway, D. (1979). Foundations of literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Holmes Group (1986). Teachers for tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hoy, W., Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 23-26.

Hudson, H. (1987). We're Back. New York: Crown.

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 22-25.

Hunter, M. (1982). Mastery teaching. El Segundo, CA: Tip Production.

Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13, 5-17.

Karmos, A., Jacko, C. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Kohl, H. (1976). On teaching. New York: Bantam.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lasley, T., Applegate, J., & Ellison, C. (1986). The expectations and problems of university supervisors of early field experiences. Journal of Teacher Education, 12, 127-140.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In D. Williams (Ed.), Naturalistic evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Critical Pedagogy and Teacher Education. Journal of Education, 169, 117-137.

Lortie, D. (1973). Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), The second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Magoon, J. (1977). Constructive approaches in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 47, 651-693.

Marshall, J. (1981). Making sense as a personal process. In P. Reason and J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research. New York: John Wiley.

McIntyre, D. J. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 42-45.

Newman, J. (1986). Whole language: Theory into use. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Patton, M. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Petty, W., Finn, P. (1981). Classroom teachers' reports on teaching written composition. In Perspectives on writing in grades 1-8, S. Haley-James (Ed.), Urbana, IL: National Counsel of Teachers of English.

Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 3, 19-37.

Popkewitz, T. (1984). Paradigms and ideology in educational research. London: Farmer Press.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B., & Zeichner, K. (1979). Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-62.

Postman, N. (1979). Teaching as conserving activity. New York: Delacorte Press.

Pruitt, K., & Lee, J. (1978). Hidden handcuffs in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 69-72.

Rich, S. (1985). Restoring power to teachers: The impact of "whole language". Language Arts, 62, 717-724.

Rosecky, M. (1978). Are teachers selective when using basal guidebooks? Reaching Teacher, 31, 381-384.

Rosenshine, B. (1978). Academic engaged time, content covered and direct instruction. Journal of Education, 160, 38-66.

Rosenshine, B. (1986). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. Educational Leadership, 43, 60-69.

Saran, R. (1985). The use of archives and interviews in research on educational policy. In R. Burgess (Ed.), Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods. London: Falmer Press.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practioner. New York: Basic Books.

Schwartz, M., & Schwartz, C. (1969). Problems in participant observation. In G. McCall & J. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Seperson, M., & Joyce, B. (1973). Teaching styles of student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers. Educational Leadership, 31, 146-151.

Shannon, P. (1983). The use of commercial reading materials in American elementary schools. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 68-84.

Shannon, P. (1987). Commercial reading materials, a technological ideology, and the deskilling of teachers. The Elementary School Journal, 87, 307-329.

Shannon, P. (1989). The struggle for control of literacy lessons. Language Arts, 66, 625-634.

Shor, I. (1986). Equality is excellence: Transforming teacher education and the learning process. Harvard Education Review, 56, 406-426.

Shulman, L. (1983). Autonomy and obligation: The remote control of teaching. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Smith, F. (1978). Understanding reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Smith, F. (1986). Insult to intelligence: The bureaucratic invasion of our classrooms. New York: Arbor House.

Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teaching education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 2-9.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Tabachnick, B., & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 28-36.

Tom, A. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 35-43.

U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman & J. Backus (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Vol 3, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wise, A. (1988). Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 328-333.

Woodward, A. (1986). Over-programmed materials: Taking the teacher out of teaching. American Educator, 10, 26-31.

Yee, H. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Teacher Education, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 3-9.

Zeichner, K. (1985). The ecology of field experiences: Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18, 14-52.

Zeichner, K. (1986). Individual and Institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. In J. Raths & L. Katz (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Vol. 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 23-48.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teachers, 11, 1-25.

Zimpher, N. (1986). Current trends in research on university supervision of student teaching. In M. Haberman and J. Backus (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, vol. 3. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Appendix A

Questions Asked During Initial Interviews:

1. What are some of the reasons you have for going into teaching?

2. During your field experiences did you teach some language arts activities? (language arts can encompass any subject area that uses reading and writing). Describe some of the things you did.

3. During your field experiences did you observe teachers teaching language arts activities. Describe some of the different kinds of instruction (activities) that you observed. What did you think about the different kinds?

4. What are some differences between a skill-based reading proagram and a whole language reading program?

5. Let's assume your cooperating teacher gives you the freedom to teach language arts the way you would like to, but the school has a traditional (skill-based) approach. Would you feel comfortable trying some whole language activities? To what degree (still use some traditional methods for example the basal readers, or would you attempt to use all whole language?) When would you begin encorporating the activities?

6. Imagine you were observing a video tape of an ideal classroom. What kinds of things would you see?

7. Is their anything unique about your professional preparation program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CURRICULUM VITA

Michael S. Smith
4 Carriage Drive North
St. Joseph, Missouri 64506
Phone: (816) 233-0004

ACADEMIC DEGREES:

Ashland College 1978	B. A. in Elementary Education and B. A. in Psychology.
Dayton University 1985	M. S. in Educational Counseling
Indiana University 1990	Ph. D. Major: Curriculum Studies Minor: Language Education

ELEMENTARY AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

1978-1986	Taught 6th grade in Reynoldsburg City Schools (Ohio).
1986 (Fall)	Co-Instructor of "Issues of Kindergarten and Elementary Teachers" at Indiana University
1986 (Spring)	University Supervisor of student teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior high at Indiana University
1987 (Fall)	Instructor for "Issues of Kindergarten and Elementary Teachers" at Indiana University
1988-1989	University Supervisor for both spring and fall semesters at Indiana University
1990-Present	Assistant Professor in Elementary Education at Missouri Western State College